

1992 NCAA CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

National Collegiate Athletic Association



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

6201 College Boulevard Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422 913/339-1906 April 1992

Edited By: Wallace I. Renfro, Assistant Executive Director for Publishing, and Michael V. Earle, Director of Publishing.

NCAA, NCAA seal, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

Table of Contents

J. (Register 1992
4	Administrative Organization
(Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Media Proceedings at the 86th NCAA Convention
II. F	Proceedings at the 86th NCAA Convention
(Delling Bilginger Species
	Opening Remarks Convention Committees
	Convention Committees
	Report of Council Report of Subcommittee on Certification
	Report of Subcommittee on Certification
	Report of Memorial Resolutions Committee State of the Association Address
	State of the Association Address. Division I-A Business Session
	Division I-A Business Session Opening Remarks
	Opening Remarks Proposed Amendments
	Proposed Amendments Coaching Limitations—Division I.A (No. 51)
	Coaching Limitations—Division I-A (No.51) Maximum Initial Grants-in-Aid—Partial Qualiformed N
	Maximum Initial Grants-in-Aid—Partial Qualifiers and Nonqualifiers (No. 66) Spring Football Practice—Divisions I-A and I-AA (No. 22)
	Spring Football Practice—Divisions I-A and I-AA (No. 83) Recruiting—Division I-A Head Football Coach (No. 183)
	Recruiting—Division I-A Head Football Coach (No. 130) Permissible Contacts (No. 131)
	Permissible Contacts (No. 131). Football—Visits to High School (No. 132)
	Football—Visits to High School (No. 132)
	Football Evaluations (No. 132)
	Football Evaluations (No. 194)
	Evaluations—Division I Poethall (A) 1953
	Evaluations—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (No. 136). Dead Period—Division I-A Football (No. 137)
	Dead Period — Division I-A Football (No. 192)
D	Wision I-AA Business Socies
	Opening Remarks
	Opening Remarks Proposed Amendments Restricted-Earnings Coaches — Versity/India Versity Proposed
	Restricted-Farnings Coaches V-
	Restricted-Earnings Coaches — Division LAA (No. 54)
	Restricted-Earnings Coaches—Division I-AA (No. 54) Restricted-Earnings Coach—Division I-AA (No. 55) Heritage Bowl (No. 86)
	Heritage Bowl (No. 86)
	Postseason Football Games (No. 97)
	Football Evaluations (No. 194)
	Football Evaluations (No 134) Evaluations—Division I-A Football (No. 135) Evaluations—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (No. 136)
	Evaluations - Divisions I A and I AA E.
	Spring Football Practice Description 1900
	Dead Period – Divisions I-A and I-AA (No 83) Dead Period – Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (No 137). Review of Proposed Amendments.
	Review of Proposed Amand
Dı	vision I-AAA Business Session
	Opening Remarks
	Review of Proposed Amond-
Dı	vision II Business Session Opening Remarks
(Opening Remarks Review of Division II Presidents Survey
1	Review of Division II Providents Com
1	Review of Proposed Amendments
I	Report of Championships Committee
١,	Vaivers
F	Report of Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
1	Vominating Committee
F	Vominating Committee
	Core-Curriculum Requirements (No. 14)
	Satisfactory Progress Mad V. m. 12
	Satisfactory Progress - Regular Agademic Very (N. 19)
	Satisfactory Progress - Fulfillment of Domes B
	Grade-Point Assesses (N. 01)
Con	tinuation of Division II Business Session 126
	100
le o	f Contents
. + 0	

Opening Remarks Report on Division I-AAA Football Proposed Amondments	.133
4 44" A HILL DHEDHINGH FINAL Semester/Ducarte- (Mr. 20)	
Outside Competition (No. 46)	140
Outside Competition (No. 46). Maximum Awards — Division II (No. 64). Honorary Academic Awards (No. 70)	142
Divisions I and II Playing and Practice Seasons—Individual Sports (No. 88)	146
Obeding Remarks	
Reports of Committees. Executive Committee.	156
Division III Championships Committee	156
reports of Committees	
Division III Playing and Practice Seasons (No. 32)	
Division III Playing and Practice Seasons (No. 32)	
Maximum Dates of Competition—Fencing (No. 91) Preseason Soccer Scrimmages (No. 94) Division III Playing and Debut (1997)	96
Division III Playing and Practice Seasons—Dividing Segments (No. 95)	97
Division III Playing and Practice Seasons—Athletically Related Activities (No. 96)	98
Division III Playing and Practice Seasons—Athletically Related Activities (No. 96)1	98
First Contest or Date of Competition—Division III Fall Sports (No. 101)	02
Division III Preseason Practice Opportunities—Traditional Segment (No. 99))3
Preseason Rackothall Preseason Constitutional Segment (No 100)20)4
Preseason Practice Opportunities — Division III Basketball (No. 102)20)4
)C
Maximum Dates of Competition Limitations—Division III Tennis (No. 107)	19
Maximum Dates of Competition Limitations—Division III Football (No. 106)	19
Opening Remarks	0
	0
Percentage of the property of	
(No. 108)	c
21	L.
1992 Convention Proceedings	_
1992 Convention Proceedings	5

Comments
Proposed Amendments
Related Activities 222
Review of Proposition (No. 97)
Review of Proposed Amendments
224 Division I Business Session 228 Opening Remarks 230 Proposed Amendment 230
Prinosed American
Core-Curried and Core-C
Core-Curriculum Requirements (No. 14) 230
Satisfactory Progress—Mid-Year Transfer Student (No. 10)
Continuation of Diogress — Regular Academic Year (No. 20)
Proposed Amendment Business Session
Satisfactory Progress — Fulfillment of Degree Requirements and Minimum State Point Average (No. 21).
Grade-Point Average (No. 21)
Satisfactory Progress (No. 24)
Two-Vear Colleges - Remedial, Tutorial or Noncredit Courses (No. 25)
Figure 1 Aid S. Franster Eligibility—Nonqualifier (No. 26)
Financial Aid—Summer School (No. 67). 254 Financial Aid—Summer School (No. 67). 257 Summer Financial Aid—Incoming Student-Athletes (No. 30). 259 Full-Time Enrollment—Final Semester/Quarter (No. 38). 261
Full-Time Enrollment—Final Semester/Quarter (No. 30)
Hardshin Wayson D
Hardship Waiver—Division I (No. 42)
Restricted Forman 403
267 Restricted-Earnings Coach (No. 49)
Additional Poststills — wrestiing (No 57)
Additional Restricted-Earnings Coaches (No. 58)
Coaching Limitations—Volunteer Coach (No. 58)
Honorana Anna Division I Women's Baskethell (No. 62)
Equivalence Committee (No. 70)
Mombasty Computations (No 71)
Continuation of Division I Financial Aid (No. 72)
Proposed Amendments
Financial Manufactions—Men's Ice Hockey (No. 74)
Financial Management (No. 75)
Contest Exemption 1 Basketball (No. 76)284
Resolution: Division I Basketball (No. 81)
Maximum Did it laying and Practice Seasons—Induidual C
Maximum Dates of Competition—Fencing (No. 91)
First Contests Limitations—Field Hockey (No. 92)
First Contest Dimitations—Field Hockey (No. 92) 287 First Contest Date—Divisions I and II Soccer (No. 93) 287 Preseason Soccer Scrimmages (No. 94) 288 Athletics Housing (No. 120) 289 Outside Comparities
Athletics Housing (No. 120)
Outside Competition (No. 46)
Rasketholl (A)
Recruiting C-11
Recruiting—Collect and Toll-Free Telephone Calls (No. 126)
Recruiting Telephone Calls (No. 128)
Reconsideration Calls (No. 129)
Reconsideration of Proposal No 129
Institutional Stationery (No. 139)
Resolution Discounting Rates Report (No. 140)
Resolution Division I Championships Eligibility (No. 149)
Table of Contents297

	NOAM Honors Diffing	200
	General Business Session	.320
	Supplement to Memorial Resolutions Committee Report	320
	Opening Remarks	320
	Proposed Amendments	321
	Consent Package	
	Reconsideration of Division Voting Action	321
	Reconsideration of Restricted-Earnings Coaches - Division I-AA (No. 54)	321
	Reconsideration of Maximum Awards—Division II (No. 64)	.322
	Reconsideration of Outside Competition (No. 46)	
	Reconsideration of Football Evaluations (No 134)	323
	Proposed Amendments	323
	Proposed Amendments	.323
	Coaches' Athletically Related Income (No. 28)	.324
	Division I-AAA Football (No. 34)	.324
	Resolution: Presidential Authority and Institutional Responsibility (No. 35)	334
	Resolution: Financial Issues (No. 36)	
	Practice Eligibility (No. 37)	
	Drug-Testing Consent Form (No 41)	225
	Hardship Waiver (No. 43)	227
	Amateurism—Contract Negotiations (No 47)	227
	Cancellation of Financial Aid (No. 68)	
	Tuition Awards — Former Student-Athletes (No. 69)	240
	Paralution Faderally Mandated Dislama of Athletically Deleted	341
	Resolution: Federally Mandated Disclosure of Athletically Related Revenues and Expenditures (No. 154)	0.40
	Continuation of General Business Session	.342
	Continuation of General Business Session	344
	Division I Council and Presidents Commission Representatives (No. 109)	344
	Amendment—Sponsorship (No. 112)	345
	Amendments to Federated Provisions (No. 113)	
	Revised Legislative Calendar (No. 114)	
	Reconsideration of Division I-AAA Football (No_34)	
	Legislative Deadlines—Submission Dates and Times (No. 115)	
	Resolution: Council Waiver Authority (No. 117)	.351
	Division-Specific Playing Rules (No. 118)	
	Surgical Expenses (No. 119)	352
	Resolution: NCAA Paperwork (No. 123)	
	Resolution: Student-Athlete Committees (No. 124)	
	Football—Visits to High School (No. 132)	.355
	Resolution: NCAA-Sponsored Summer Basketball Camps (No. 141)	.355
•	Unethical Conduct (No. 142)	.356
	Disciplinary Measures—Television Coverage (No. 143)	357
	Disciplinary Measures—Broad-Based Revenue Distribution Moneys (No. 144)	.357
	Division II Championships—Women's Field Hockey, Men's Ice Hockey	
	and Men's Lacrosse (No. 145)	.358
	Championship Criteria—Minimum Sponsorship Exemption (No. 146)	.359
	Championship Criteria Minimum Sponsorship Exemption (No. 147)	.360
	Interpretations Committee (No 150)	.360
	NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (No. 151)	.361
	Women's Volleyball Rules Committee (No. 153)	.362
	Resolution: Biennial Legislative Convention (No. 116)	364
	Closing Remarks	
Ш	Appendices	
	A. Legislative Proposals	. 1
	B. Roll-Call Voting	-184
	C. Convention Committees.	
	D. Past Convention Sites	
	E. NCAA Officers, 1906-1992	

1992 Convention Proceedings

MOLLIT D

Administrative Organization

NCAA Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee includes the NCAA officers (president, secretary-treasurer, division vice-presidents) and the NCAA executive director

President

JUDITH M. SWEET Director of Athletics University of California, San Diego LaJolla, California 92093-0905 (Term Expires January 1993*)

Secretary-Treasurer

B. J. SKELTON

Vice-Provost, Dean, Admissions and Registration Clemson University Clemson, South Carolina 29634-5126 (Term Expires January 1993*)

Executive Director

RICHARD D. SCHULTZ 6201 College Boulevard Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422

Division I Vice-President: Douglas S. Hobbs, University of California, Los

Angeles (Term Expires January 1992*)

Division II Vice-President: Anthony F. Ceddia, Shippensburg University of

Pennsylvania (Term Expires January 1993*)

Division III Vice-President: Rocco J. Carzo, Tufts University (Term Expires January 1992*)

NCAA Staff Liaison: Ted C. Tow

NCAA Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chair and secretary, respectively. The other 44 members of the Council shall include 22 members from Division I (including at least two chief executive officers and at least six women), 11 members from Division II (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women), and 11 members from Division III (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women). The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the membership of that division present and voting at the division business session during the annual Convention. [Constitution 4.1.]

*Not eligible for reelection to this position
Administrative Organization

Divi	sion (Name, Institution	_	
Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires	Douglas S. Hobbs	Representing I-A	Term Expires
Warner Alford Director of Athletics University of Mississippi University, Mississippi 38677	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*	Faculty Athletics Representative University of California Los Angeles, California 90024 Michael L. Kasavana	Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Thurston E. Banks Associate Professor of Chemistry Tennessee Technological University Cookeville, Tennessee 38505	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan. 1993*	Professor, Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Management Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan 48824	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1993*
Charles Cavagnaro Director of Athletics Memphis State University Memphis, Tennessee 38152	I-A Independent South (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*	David B. Keilitz Director of Athletics Central Michigan University Mount Pleasant, Michigan 48859	I-A Mid-American Athletic Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1993*
Irwin M. Cohen Director of Athletics Northeastern University Boston, Massachusetts 02115	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1994*	Jim G. Malik Professor of Chemistry San Diego State University San Diego, California 92182	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1992
Susan A. Collins Assistant Director of Athletics George Mason University Fairfax, Virginia 22030	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*	William M. Sangster Director, International Programs Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, Georgia 30332	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1992
Joseph N. Crowley President University of Nevada Reno, Nevada 89557	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*	Albert E. Smith President South Carolina State College Orangeburg, South Carolina 29117	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1993*
Kay Don Associate Director of Athletics California State University Long Beach, California 90840-0118	I-A Big West Conference	Jan. 1995°	Doris R. Soladay Associate Director of Athletics Syracuse University Syracuse, New York 13244-5020	I-At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1995*
R. Elaine Dreidame Senior Associate Director of Athletics University of Dayton Dayton, Ohio 45469	(Region 4) I-AAA (Region 3)	Jan. 1994*	Craig Thompson Commissioner Sun Belt Conference One Galleria Boulevard, Suite 2115 Metairie, Louisiana 70001	I-AAA (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Daniel G. Gibbens Professor of Law University of Oklahoma Norman, Oklahoma 73019	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1994*	Patricia Viverito Commissioner Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference 7750 Clayton Road, Suite 204 St Louis, Missouri 63117	I-At Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1995*
Frederick E. Gruninger Director of Athletics Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903	I-A Independent North (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*	Shirley A. Walker Coordinator of Women's Sports/ Head Basketball Coach Alcorn State University Lorman, Mississippi 39096	I-At Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1995*
*Not eligible for reelection to this position.			*Not eligible for reelection to this position		

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Administrative Organization ______9

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires	Name, Institution	
Frank Windegger Director of Athletics Texas Christian University Fort Worth, Texas 76129	I-A Southwest Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1993*	Harold J. McGee President Jacksonville State University Jacksonville, Alabama 36265 (Region 2)	Term Expires Jan. 1995*
W. Wayne Wright Director of Athletics Pepperdine University Malibu, California 90263	I-AAA (Region 4)	Jan. 1992	Karen L. Miller Director of Athletics California State Polytechnic University Pomona, California 91768 (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Divison Name, Institution	ion II	Term Expires	Robert A. Oliver Director of Athletics University of Northern Colorado	Jan. 1995*
Ollie Bowman Dean of Admissions Hampton University		Jan. 1994*	Greeley, Colorado 80639 (Region 4)	
Hampton, Virginia 23668 (Region 2) Anthony F. Ceddia President		Jan. 1993*	Douglas T. Porter Director of Athletics Fort Valley State College Fort Valley, Georgia 31030	Jan. 1993*
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania Shippensburg, Pennsylvania 17257 (Region 1)			(Region 2) Marjorie A. Trout Director of Women's Athletics Millersville University of Pennsylvania	Jan. 1992*
Dorothy E. Dreyer Assistant Professor of Speech Wayne State University Detroit, Michigan 48202		Jan. 1992	(Region 1)	
(Region 3)			Division III Name, Institution	
James Fallis Director of Athletics		Jan. 1993*	Dolores A. Bogard	Term Expires
Lake Superior State University Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan 49783 (Region 3)			Associate Director of Athletics State University College Cortland, New York 13045 (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
Richard A. Johanningmeier Director of Athletics Washburn University Topeka, Kansas 66621 (Region 4)		Jan. 1992	Robert G. Bottoms President DePauw University Greencastle. Indiana 46135 (Region 3)	Jan. 1995*
Chuck Lindernenn Director of Athletics Humboldt State University Arcata, California 95521 (Region 4)		Jan. 1995*	Rocco J. Carzo Director of Athletics Tufts University Medford, Massachusetts 02155 (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*
*Not eligible for reelection to this position			*Not eligible for reelection to this position.	
10	1992 Convention	n Proceedings	Administrative Organization	
			0277011	 11

week and the first the second

Name, Institution	Term Expires	NCAA Staff Liaison:
Arthur Eason	Jan. 1993*	Richard D. Schultz (Evocutive D.
Director of Athletics	5an. 1555	TOW COUNCIL DIVISION IV
William Paterson College		· Carol P. Powell (Division II)
Wayne, New Jersey 07470		Nancy L. Mitchell (Division 111)
(Region 1)		John H. Leavens / Popper in a co
Marjorie Giles	Jan. 1994*	Coproving Notician (1 ediciation and the
Dean of Students	Jan. 1554	Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)
Central College		
Pella, Iowa 50219		
(Region 4)		
George M. Harmon	Jan. 1993*	
President	Oun. 1555	
Millsaps College		
Jackson, Mississippi 39210		
(Region 3)		
John H. Harvey	Jan. 1995*	
Director of Athletics		
Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213		
(Region 2)		•
,		t
David A. Jacobs	Jan. 1993*	T.
Director of Athletics		•
Whittier College Whittier, California 90608		
(Region 4)		
· ·		•
William E. Lide	Jan, 1994*	
Director of Athletics		
Salisbury State University Salisbury, Maryland 21801		
(Region 1)		
Jonaphas B. Chillian I.		
Jenepher P. Shillingford Director of Athletics	Jan. 1992*	
Bryn Mawr College		
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania 19010	;	
(Region 2)	<u> </u>	
Sandra R. Weeden	1	
Associate Professor of Education/	Jan. 1994*	
Director of Women's Athletics		
State University of New York		
Stony Brook, New York 11794	į.	
(Region 2)		
*Not eligible for reelection to this position		
12	1992 Convention Proceedings	
	1772 Convention Proceedings	Administrative Organization
		13

Entered with a Commence of the man will be the second

NCAA Executive Committee

The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The division vice-presidents shall be members, and the remaining nine members are elected by the Council for terms of five years. [Constitution 4.2.]

Division	Name, Institution	Term Expires
III	Mary R. Barrett Associate Director of Athletics University of Massachusetts Boston, Massachusetts 02125	Jan. 1996*
I-AA	Charles S. Boone Director of Athletics University of Richmond Richmond, Virginia 23173	Jan. 1995*
III VP	Rocco J. Carzo Director of Athletics Tufts University Medford, Massachusetts 02155	Jan. 1992*
II VP	Anthony F. Ceddia President Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania Shippensburg, Pennsylvania 17257	Jan. 1993*
l-A	Eugene F. Corrigan Commissioner Atlantic Coast Conference PO Drawer ACC Greensboro, North Carolina 27419-6999	Jan. 1993*
I-A	Cedric W. Dempsey Director of Athletics University of Arizona Tucson, Arizona 85721	Jan. 1995*
I-AAA	Don J. DiJulia Assistant Vice-President and Director of Athletics St. Joseph's University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131	Jan. 1995*
I-AA	Kenneth A. Free Commissioner Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference 102 North Elm Street, Suite 401 Greensboro, North Carolina 27401	Jan. 1996*
I-A	Martha E. Hawthorne Assistant Director of Athletics Rice University Houston, Texas 77251	Jan. 1992*

<i>Division</i> I VP (I-A)	Name, Institution Douglas S. Hobbs Faculty Athletics Representative University of California	<i>Term Expires</i> Jan. 1992*		
I-A	Los Angeles, California 90024 Phyllis L. Howlett Assistant Commissioner Big Ten Conference 1500 West Higgins Road Park Ridge, Illinois 60068-6300	Jan. 1995 ⁺		
II	Jerry M. Hughes Director of Athletics Central Missouri State University Warrensburg, Missouri 64093	Jan. 1996*		
NCAA Staff Liaison: Richard D. Schultz (Executive Director) Patricia E. Bork (Executive Committee, Division I) Thomas W Jernstedt (Division I) Dennis L. Poppe (Division II) Donna J. Noonan (Division III) Louis J. Spry (Business Affairs and Convention Planning) Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)				

*Not eligible for reelection to this position,

Administrative Organization _______15

^{*}Not eligible for reelection to this position

Presidents Commission

The Presidents Commission is elected by a mail vote of the chief executive officers of all member institutions (or selected by the Division I-A conferences). The 44 members shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members. At least three women shall be included. preferably one from each division. The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the chief executive officers of that division (or by the Division I-A conferences). The officers of the Presidents Commission are elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the Commission's members to serve for two years.

	Term as Chair Expires
Commission Chair: R. Gerald Turner University of Mississippi	Jan. 1992*
Division I Chair: William H. Cunningham University of Texas at Austin	Jan. 1993*
Division II Chair: Asa N. Green Livingston University	Jan. 1992*
Division III Chair: David L. Warren Ohio Wesleyan University	Jan. 1992*

Division I

2171010111					
Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires			
Gene A. Budig Chancellor University of Kansas Lawrence, Kansas 66045	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1995*			
Joseph N. Crowley President University of Nevada Reno, Nevada 89557	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1992			
William H. Cunningham President University of Texas Austin, Texas 78712	I-A Southwest Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1994*			
Rev. Albert J. DiUlio President Marquette University Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233	I-AAA At Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1992*			

I-AAA At Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1992*
1992 Con	vention Proceedings
	At Large (Region 3)

Name, Institution	Representing	T 5
Ronald G. Eaglin Chancellor Coastal Carolina College of the University of South Carolina Conway, South Carolina 29526	I-AAA At Large (Region 2)	Term Expires Jan. 1995*
Gail J. Fullerton President San Jose State University San Jose, California 95192	I-A At Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Sheldon Hackney President University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1993*
Thomas K. Hearn Jr. President Wake Forest University Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27109	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*
Stanley O. Ikenberry President University of Illinois, Champaign Urbana, Illinois 61801	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1992
Eamon Kelly President Tulane University New Orleans, Louisiana 70118	I-A Independent South (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
Samuel H. Magill President Monmouth College West Long Branch, New Jersey 07764	I-AAA At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1994*
James D. McComas President Virginia Polytechnic Institute Blacksburg, Virginia 24061	I-A Independent North (Region 2)	Jan. 1993
Curtis McCray President California State University Long Beach, California 90840-0118	I-A Big West Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1995*
Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien Chancellor Jniversity of New Orleans New Orleans, Louisiana 70148	I-AAA At Large (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*
Not eligible for reelection to this position.		

Administrative Organization

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires	Name, Institution	
Frederick Obear Chancellor University of Tennessee Chattanooga, Tennessee 37403	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*	Thomas W. Cole Jr. President Clark Atlanta University Atlanta, Georgia 30314 (Region 2)	<i>Term Expires</i> Jan. 1995*
Oscar C. Page President Austin Peay State University Clarksville, Tennessee 37044-4576	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*	Asa N. Green President Livingston University Livingston, Alabama 35470	Jan. 1992*
William E. Shelton President Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197	I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1993	(Region 2) Rodney C. Kelchner President Mansfield University of Pennsylvania	Jan. 1994*
Albert J. Simone President University of Hawaii	I-A Western Athletic Conference	Jan. 1993	Mansfield, Pennsylvania 16933 (Region 1) Arend D. Lubbers	
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822-2370 William W. Sutton President Mississippi Valley State University	(Region 4) I-AA At Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1993	President Grand Valley State University Allendale, Michigan 49401 (Region 3)	Jan. 1994*
Itta Bena, Mississippi 38941 Stephen Joel Trachtenberg President	I-AAA At Large	Jan. 1993*	John W. Moore President California State University, Stanislaus Turlock, California 95380 (Region 4)	Jan. 1995 ° ∙
George Washington University Washington, D.C. 20052 R. Gerald Turner Chancellor University of Mississippi	(Region 1) I-A Southeastern Conference	Jan. 1992*	Walter R. Peterson President Franklin Pierce College Rindge, New Hampshire 03461 (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*
University, Mississippi 38677 Charles E. Young Chancellor University of California Los Angeles, California 90024	(Region 2) I-A Pacific-10 Conference	Јап. 1994 *	Margaret R. Preska President Mankato State University Mankato, Minnesota 56001 (Region 3)	Jan. 1992*
•	(Region 4)	Term Expires	Judith A. Ramaley President Portland State University Portland, Oregon 97207 (Region 4)	Jan. 1993
Anthony James Catanese President Florida Atlantic University Boca Raton, Florida 33431 (Region 2)		Jan. 1994*	Tyronza R. Richmond Chancellor North Carolina Central University Durham, North Carolina 27707 (Region 2)	Jan. 1993*
*Not eligible for reelection to this position			*Not eligible for reelection to this position	
18	1992 Conve	ntion Proceedings	Administrative Organization	19

the state of the s

Name, Institution Olin B. Sansbury Jr. Chancellor University of South Carolina Spartanburg, South Carolina 29303 (Region 2) Division III Name, Institution James R. Appleton President University of Redlands Redlands, California 92373-0999 (Region 4) David G. Carter President Eastern Connecticut State University Willimantic, Connecticut 06226 (Region 1) Alice Chandler President State University College New Paltz, New York 12562 (Region 2) Edward G. Coll Jr. President Alfred University Alfred, New York 14802 (Region 2) Anthony J. Diekema President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3) Rev. Michael J. Lavelle President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3) Rev. Michael J. Lavelle President Calvin College Jan. 1993* President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3) Rev. Michael J. Lavelle President Calvin College Grand Marker President Cornell College Mount Vernon, lowa 52314 (Region 4) *Not eligible for reelection to this position. 20 —————————————————————————————————		
Chancellor University of South Carolina Spartanburg, South Carolina 29303 (Region 2) Division III Name, Institution James R. Appleton President University of Redlands Redlands, California 92373-0999 (Region 4) David G. Carter President Eastern Connecticut State University Willimantic, Connecticut 06226 (Region 1) Alice Chandler President State University College New Paltz, New York 12562 (Region 2) Edward G. Coll Jr. President Alfred University Alfred, New York 14802 (Region 2) Anthony J. Diekema President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3) Rev. Michael J. Lavelle President John Carroll University University Heights, Ohio 44118-4581 (Region 3) David Marker President Cornell College Mount Vernon, Iowa 52314 (Region 4) *Not eligible for reelection to this position.	·	Term Expires
Name, Institution James R. Appleton President University of Redlands Redlands, California 92373-0999 (Region 4) David G. Carter President Eastern Connecticut State University Willimantic, Connecticut 06226 (Region 1) Alice Chandler President State University College New Paltz, New York 12562 (Region 2) Edward G. Coll Jr. President Alfred University Alfred University Alfred University Alfred New York 14802 (Region 2) Anthony J. Diekema President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3) Rev. Michael J. Lavelle President John Carroll University University Heights, Ohio 44118-4581 (Region 3) David Marker President Cornell College Mount Vernon, Iowa 52314 (Region 4) *Not eligible for reelection to this position.	Chancellor University of South Carolina Spartanburg, South Carolina 29303	Jan. 1995*
James R. Appleton President University of Redlands Redlands, California 92373-0999 (Region 4) David G. Carter President Eastern Connecticut State University Willimantic, Connecticut 06226 (Region 1) Alice Chandler President State University College New Paltz, New York 12562 (Region 2) Edward G. Coll Jr. President Alfred University Alfred, New York 14802 (Region 2) Anthony J. Diekema President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3) Rev. Michael J. Lavelle President John Carroll University University Heights, Ohio 44118-4581 (Region 3) David Marker President Cornell College Mount Vernon, Iowa 52314 (Region 4) *Not eligible for reelection to this position.	Division III	
President University of Redlands Redlands, California 92373-0999 (Region 4) David G. Carter President Eastern Connecticut State University Willimantic, Connecticut 06226 (Region 1) Alice Chandler President State University College New Paltz, New York 12562 (Region 2) Edward G. Coll Jr. President Alfred University Alfred, New York 14802 (Region 2) Anthony J. Diekema President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3) Rev. Michael J. Lavelle President John Carroll University University Heights, Ohio 44118-4581 (Region 3) David Marker President Cornell College Mount Vernon, lowa 52314 (Region 4) *Not eligible for reelection to this position.	Name, Institution	Term Expires
President Eastern Connecticut State University Willimantic, Connecticut 06226 (Region 1) Alice Chandler President State University College New Paltz, New York 12562 (Region 2) Edward G. Coll Jr. President Alfred University Alfred, New York 14802 (Region 2) Anthony J. Diekema President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3) Rev. Michael J. Lavelle President John Carroll University University Heights, Ohio 44118-4581 (Region 3) David Marker President Cornell College Mount Vernon, lowa 52314 (Region 4) *Not eligible for reelection to this position.	President University of Redlands Redlands, California 92373-0999	Jan. 1995*
President State University College New Paltz, New York 12562 (Region 2) Edward G. Coll Jr. President Alfred University Alfred, New York 14802 (Region 2) Anthony J. Diekema President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3) Rev. Michael J. Lavelle President John Carroll University University Heights, Ohio 44118-4581 (Region 3) David Marker President Cornell College Mount Vernon, Iowa 52314 (Region 4)	President Eastern Connecticut State University Willimantic, Connecticut 06226	Jan. 1993
President Alfred University Alfred, New York 14802 (Region 2) Anthony J. Diekema President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3) Rev. Michael J. Lavelle President John Carroll University University Heights, Ohio 44118-4581 (Region 3) David Marker President Cornell College Mount Vernon, lowa 52314 (Region 4) *Not eligible for reelection to this position.	President State University College New Paltz, New York 12562	Jan. 1994 ⁺
President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3) Rev. Michael J. Lavelle President John Carroll University University Heights, Ohio 44118-4581 (Region 3) David Marker President Cornell College Mount Vernon, lowa 52314 (Region 4) *Not eligible for reelection to this position.	President Alfred University Alfred, New York 14802	Jan. 1992*
President John Carroll University University Heights, Ohio 44118-4581 (Region 3) David Marker President Cornell College Mount Vernon, lowa 52314 (Region 4) *Not eligible for reelection to this position.	President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506	Jan. 1 99 2*
President Cornell College Mount Vernon, lowa 52314 (Region 4) *Not eligible for reelection to this position.	President John Carroll University University Heights, Ohio 44118-4581	Jan. 1995*
	President Cornell College Mount Vernon, Iowa 52314	Jan. 1993*
201992 Convention Proceedings	*Not eligible for reelection to this position.	
	20	1992 Convention Proceedings

Name, Institution	
Roger H. Martin President Moravian College Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18018 (Region 2)	<i>Term Expires</i> Jan. 1992*
Jon C. Strauss President Worcester Polytechnic Institute Worcester, Massachusetts 01609 (Region 1)	Jan. 1994*
David L. Warren President Ohio Wesleyan University Delaware, Ohio 43015 (Region 3)	Jan. 1993*
Cordell Wynn President Stillman College Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35403 (Region 3)	Jan. 1995 ⁺
NCAA Staff Liaison Richard D. Schultz (Executive Director) Fed C. Tow (Presidents Commission, Division I) Carol P. Powell (Division III) Jancy L. Mitchell (Division III) ohn H. Leavens (Recording Secretary) Stephen R. Morgan (Legislation and Interpretations) ydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)	·)

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Administrative Organization _______21

NCAA National Office

Richard D. Schultz, Executive Director

Thomas W. Jernstedt, Associate Executive Director Stephen R. Morgan, Associate Executive Director Louis J. Spry, Associate Executive Director Ted C. Tow, Associate Executive Director

Lydia L. Sanchez, Director of Conventions and Meetings/ Assistant to the Executive Director

Administration

Merrily Dean Baker, Assistant Executive Director for Administration
Stanley D. Johnson, Director of Professional Development
Edward A. Thiebe, Director of Youth Programs
Frank D. Uryasz, Director of Sports Sciences
Ursula R. Walsh, Director of Research

Ursula R. Walsh, Director of Research
Sharon K. Cessna, Youth Programs Coordinator
Rochelle M. Collins, Youth Programs Coordinator
Randall W. Dick, Assistant Director of Sports Sciences
Ellen Hanley, Assistant Director of Sports Sciences
Donna L. Hockersmith, Administrative Assistant for Sports Sciences
Todd A. Petr, Assistant Director of Research
Christine M. Pohl, Youth Programs Coordinator
Patricia A. Schaefer, Administrative Assistant for Sports Sciences
Fannie B. Vaughan, Executive Assistant
Shirley Whitacre, Membership Coordinator

Business

Frank E. Marshall, Assistant Executive Director for Business Affairs
Keith E. Martin, Director of Accounting
Michael S. McNeely, Director of Operations
Daniel W. Spencer, Director of Data Processing
Susan J. Brown, Programmer/Analyst
Douglas A. Carpenter, Programmer/Analyst
Kelly G. Conway, Programmer/Analyst

Kathy L. Day, Programmer/Analyst William C. Foreman, Building Manager Marla B. Gleason, Office Services Center Manager Mary Hill, Programmer/Analyst Suzanne E. Kerley, Personnel Manager

Suzanne E. Kerley, *Personnel Manager*De Ann M. Mortensen, *Assistant Personnel Manager*Sarah A. Thomas, *Accountant*Danny W. Womack, *Programmer/Analyst*

Championships

Patricia E. Bork, Assistant Executive Director for Championships

Donna J. Noonan, Director of Championships
Dennis L. Poppe, Director of Championships
William R. Hancock, Director of Division I Men's Basketball Championship
Betsy G. Stephenson, Director of Division I Men's Basketball Operations

R. Wayne Burrow, Assistant Director of Championships
Philip A. Buttafuoco, Assistant Director of Championships
Daniel A. Calandro, Assistant Director of Championships
Thomas A. Jacobs, Assistant Director of Championships
Harley W. Lewis, Assistant Director of Championships
Deborah R. Nelson, Assistant Director of Championships
Michelle A. Pond, Assistant Director of Championships
Joseph A. Quinlan Jr., Assistant Director of Division I Men's
Basketball Championship
Marie T. Tuite, Assistant Director of Championships

Communications

David E. Cawood, Assistant Executive Director for Communications

James A. Marchiony, Director of Communications

John T. Waters, *Director of Licensing*Alfred B. White, *Director of Promotions*

Kerwin E. Hudson, Assistant Director of Communications Regina L. McNeal, Assistant Director of Communications James M. Van Valkenburg, Director of Statistics Cynthia M. Van Matre, Assistant Director of Promotions James F. Wright, Assistant Director of Communications

Richard M. Campbell, Assistant Statistics Coordinator Gary K. Johnson, Assistant Statistics Coordinator John D. Painter, Assistant Statistics Coordinator Sean W. Straziscar, Assistant Statistics Coordinator

Ronald Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service* 119 West 57th Street, Suite 1212, New York, N.Y. 10019

Compliance Services

John H. Leavens, Assistant Executive Director for Compliance Services

David A. Knopp, Director of Compliance Services

Kevin C. Lennon, Director of Compliance Services

Rebecca G. Bowman, Compliance Representative
David R. Brunk, Compliance Representative
Carolyn A. Dias, Compliance Representative
John P. Hardt, Compliance Representative
Charles A. Jones, Compliance Representative
Gary F. Karner, Compliance Representative
N. Bea Pray, Compliance Representative
Garnett Purnell, Compliance Representative
Robert W. Thomas, Compliance Representative

Administrative Organization _____

Enforcement

S. David Berst, Assistant Executive Director for Enforcement

Richard R. Hilliard, Director of Enforcement Mark P. Jones, Director of Enforcement Janet M. Justus, Director of Eligibility Robert J. Minnix, Director of Enforcement Charles E. Smrt, Director of Enforcement

Shepard C. Cooper, Enforcement Representative Lisa A. Dehon. Enforcement Representative David A. Didion, Enforcement Representative Carrie A. Dovle. Enforcement Representative Cynthia J. Gabel. Enforcement Representative Susan E. Glatter, Eligibility Representative Ramon Lao. Enforcement Representative Adrienne R. Lotson. Enforcement Representative Edward B. Lupomech, Enforcement Representative Arthur J. McAfee III. Enforcement Representative Steven D. Nelson, Enforcement Representative Louis A. Onofrio. Eligibility Representative Les Pico. Enforcement Representative William S. Saum, Enforcement Representative Robert L. Stroup III, Enforcement Representative Dirk L. Taitt. Enforcement Representative Janet S. Thomson, Eligibility Representative Marcella K. Zalot. Eligibility Representative

Legislative Services

Nancy L. Mitchell, Assistant Executive Director for Legislative Services

Daniel T. Dutcher, *Director of Legislative Services*Richard J. Evrard, *Director of Legislative Services*Stephen A. Mallonee, *Director of Legislative Services*

Craig W. Angelos, Legislative Assistant
Robert A. Burton, Legislative Assistant
Jacqueline Campbell, Legislative Assistant
David N. Chambers, Legislative Assistant
Shane Lyons, Legislative Assistant
Richard C. Perko, Legislative Assistant
Carol P. Powell, Legislative Assistant
Amy L. Privette, Legislative Assistant
Marybeth Ruskamp, Legislative Assistant
Christopher D. Schoemann, Legislative Assistant
Stan Wilcox, Legislative Assistant
Athena Yiamouyiannis, Legislative Assistant

Publishing

Wallace 1. Renfro, Assistant Executive Director for Publishing
Michael V. Earle, Director of Publishing

________1992 Convention Proceedings

P. David Pickle, Editor-in-Chief, The NCAA News Victor M. Royal, Director of Graphics

Timothy J. Lilley, Managing Editor, The NCAA News J. Gregory Summers, Assistant Director of Publishing

Maxine R. Alejos, Circulation Manager
Martin T. Benson, Publications Editor
Laura E. Bollig, Publications Editor
Theodore A. Breidenthal, Publications Editor
Jack L. Copeland, Assistant Editor, The NCAA News
Steven R. Hagwell, Publications Editor
Lee Newman, Publishing Production Manager
David D. Smale, Publications Editor

Visitors Center/Special Projects

Robert E. Sprenger, Assistant Executive Director for Visitors Center and Special Projects Will J. Rudd, Director of the Visitors Center Leslie E. Drew, Technical Director Kathryn P. Hill, Merchandise Manager Jeffrey S. Hiller, Assistant Director of the Visitors Center

Administrative Organization _____

25

86th Annual Convention **Delegates and Visitors**

Active Member Institutions

Abilene Christian University: Cecil Eager, David B. Merrell

Adams State College: William M. Fulkerson Jr.

Adelphi University: Michael Givant, Robert E. Hartwell

Akron, University of: James Dennison, Robert Fournier, David Jamison, Dawn Moore, Marion A. Ruebel

Alabama, University of, at Birmingham: Joe Davidson, Virginia D. Gauld, Charles A. McCallum, J. Dudley Pewitt, Calli Theisen Sanders

Alabama, University of, Tuscaloosa: Don Gambril, Cecil W. Ingram. Thomas L. Jones, E. Roger Sayers, Gary White

Alabama A&M University: Betty Kelly Austin, Louis Cunningham Alabama State University: C. C. Baker, Arthur D. Barnett, Wallace Maryland Jr.

Alaska, University of, Anchorage: Donald F. Behrend, W. Jack Peterson, Ronald J. Petro

Alaska, University of, Fairbanks: Ed S. Cridge, G. Lynn Lashbrook. Karen J. Morris

Albany, State University of New York University at: William M. Moore Albany State College (Georgia): Billy C. Black, Wilburn A. Campbell Jr. Albion College: Frank Joranko

Alcorn State University: Cardell Jones, Walter Washington

Alfred University: Edward G. Coll Jr., Henry Ford

Allegheny College: Norman A. Sundstrom

Alma College: Debra Mapes

American International College: Robert E. Burke, John W. O'Donnell American University: Joseph F. O'Donnell, Barbara J. Reimann

American University of Puerto Rico: William E. Baltran, Eddie Gonzalez

Amherst College: Peter J. Gooding

Angelo State University: Ollie S. Cauthen, Jerry Vandergriff

Appalachian State University: Judith Clarke, Alan J. Hauser, Roachel Laney, John E. Thomas

Arizona, University of: Cedric W. Dempsey, Ted Kissell, Kathleen L. LaRose, Manuel T. Pacheco, Robert W. Sankey

Arizona State University: Lattie F. Coor, Herman R. Frazier, Charles S. Harris, Jerry Kingston, George Montgomery, John R. Park

______1992 Convention Proceedings

Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: Randy Cale, Daniel E. Ferritor, Beverly D. Rouse, Albert M. Witte

Arkansas, University of, Little Rock: Mike Hamrick, Gary A. Heidt, Bill Walker, James H. Young

Arkansas State University: Sam R. Gennuso, Eugene W. Smith, Charles J. Thornton

Armstrong State College: John G. Brewer, Robert A. Burnett, Roger L.

Asbury College: Rita J. Pritchett

Ashland College: Alan R. Platt, Robert L. Wendling

Assumption College: Rita M. Castagna

Auburn University: Wilford S. Bailey, Joseph S. Boland III, Dave Diles, Jay Jacobs, William V. Muse, Terry Windle

Augusta College: Michael L. Gatto

Augustana College (Illinois): John R. Farwell, Bruce R. McCart

Augustana College (South Dakota): Mel Klein

Aurora University: Sam S. Bedrosian

Austin Peay State University: Oscar C. Page, Tim L. Weiser Averett College: Frank R. Campbell, Vesa K. Hiltunen

Babson College: J. Steven Stirling

Baldwin-Wallace College: Louis A. Barone

Ball State University: Don Purvis, John E. Reno, Andrea Seger, John

Barry University: G. Jean Cerra

Bates College: Suzanne R. Coffey, Jeff Schulman

Baylor University: T. C. "Skip" Cox, David M. Guinn, Bill Menefee, James S. Netherton

Bellarmine College: Joseph J. McGowan Jr., David P. O'Toole, James R. Spalding

Bemidji State University: Gerald Norris

Bennett College: Gloria R. Scott

Bentley College: Robert A. DeFelice, Sandra Thompson

Berea College: Joy Hager

Bernard M. Baruch College: William Eng

Bethany College (West Virginia): Donald D. Turner

Bethel College (Minnesota): Debra Hunter, Dale Stephens

Bethune-Cookman College: Oswald P. Bronson Sr., Shirley B. Lee, Lynn W. Thompson

Binghamton, State University of New York at: Judith B. Browne, Stephen Erber, Joel Thirer

Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Mary Gardner, Brian Johnson, Burton Reese

Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Carol Ladwig

Boston College: Rev. Robert Braunreuther, Mary Miller Carson, Chester S. Gladchuk, John F. McCutcheon

Boston University: Larry Fudge, Averill C. Haines, Gary Strickler Bowdoin College: Sidney J. Watson

Delegates and Visitors _______27

Bowie State University: Charles A. Guilford Bowling Green State University: Lester E. Barber, Mary Ellen Cloninger, John C. Gregory, Marvin L. Kumler Bradley University: Ron Ferguson, Dewey Kalmer, Ron Koperski Brandeis University: Jeffrey W. Cohen Bridgewater College (Virginia): Thomas M. Kinder Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts): John C. Harper Brigham Young University: Clayne R. Jensen, Rex E. Lee, Glen C. Tuckett, Lu Wallace, Pete Witbeck Brockport, State University College at: Linda Case, Edward M. Mateikovic, Ginny Studer Brooklyn College: Arnold Markoe, Len Roitman Brown University: Beverly E. Ledbetter, David T. Roach, Joan W. Bryant College: Leon A. Drury, Leslie LaFond, Walter Roettger Bryn Mawr College: Lisa Boyle, Jenepher P. Shillingford Bucknell University: Rosalyn K. Ewan, Rick Hartzell, Barbara A. Shailor, Timothy W. Sweeney, Brad Tufts Buena Vista College: Jim Hershberger Buffalo, State University College at: Fred J. Hartrick Buffalo, State University of New York at: Bill Breene, Charles R. Fourtner, Michael J. Gentile, Carol Greiner, William R. Greiner, Nelson E. Townsend Butler University: Richard E. Martin, John C. Parry, Mary Ann Rohleder California, University of, Berkeley: Jack Citrin, Luella J. Lilly, Chang-Lin Tien California, University of, Davis: Pamela L. Gill-Fisher, Larry Swanson California, University of, Irvine: Barbara L. Camp, Thomas J. Ford, Horace Mitchell, Jack W. Peltason, Lyman W. Porter California, University of, Los Angeles: Peter T. Dalis, Rich Herczog, Douglas S. Hobbs, Judith R. Holland, Andrea McAleenan, Jim Milhorn, Michael Sondheimer, Charles E. Young California, University of, Riverside: Lorie Harrington, Richard H. Perry, James J. Sims California, University of, San Diego: Earl W. Edwards, Marilyn Hill, Susan Hinrichsen, J. Michael Hipp, Melissa Jarrell, Heather

Rebman Vines Suenram

California State University, Bakersfield: Rudy Carvajal, Gloria A. Friedman, Richard W. Graves, George B. Hibbard California State University, Chico: Janet R. Kittell California State University, Dominguez Hills: Harold Charnofsky, Daniel G. Guerrero. Louis Murdock California State University, Fresno: John Easterbrook, Diane Milutinovich, Peter Simis, John D. Welty California State University, Fullerton: Steve DiTolla, Leon Gilbert, Maryalyce Jeremiah, Bill Shumard, Mary Ann Tripodi, Larry California State University, Hayward: Alfred R. Mathews Jr., Kenneth California State University, Long Beach: Karl Anatol, David Bernstein, Kay Don, John E. Kashiwabara, Curtis L. McCray, David O'Brien California State University, Los Angeles: Carol M. Dunn, David Thomas, Fleur Yano California State University, Northridge: Judith M. Brame, Donald Brownlee, James W. Cleary, Debby DeAngelis, Robert J. Hiegert, Fred Strache California State University, Sacramento: Donald R. Gerth, Sharon King, Lee McElroy, Robert T. Olmstead Jr., Irene Shea, Rose Leigh California State University, San Bernardino: Joe Bas, David L. California State University, Stanislaus: Joseph T. Donahue, John W. Moore, Wayne S. Pierce California University of Pennsylvania: Paul E. Burd, Thomas G. Pucci Calvin College: Anthony J. Diekema, Ralph Honderd, Doris Zuidema Cameron University: Don Davis Campbell University: Wendell L. Carr Canisius College: Thomas E. Miller, Daniel P. Starr Capital University: Armin P. Langholz, Steven Strome Carleton College: Mylla Urban Carnegie Mellon University: John H. Harvey, Joan E. Maser Carthage College: F. Gregory Campbell, Robert L. Hade Case Western Reserve University: Nancy Gray, David M. Hutter, Patricia B. Kilpatrick, Glenn Nicholls Castleton State College: James A. Zalacca Catawba College: Ginger Ashley, Dennis J. Haglan, Karl E. Hales Catholic University: Jone Dowd, Robert M. Friday Centenary College: Walter C. Stevens Central College (Iowa): Marjorie B. Giles, Richard Kacmarynski, Kenneth J. Weller Central Connecticut State University: Judith A. Davidson, Carrie A. Haag, Frank R. A. Resnick, Charles Stephenson Central Florida, University of: Richard Astro, William G. Callarman, Gene McDowell, Art W. Zeleznik Delegates and Visitors _____

Glenn Shenker, Bob H. Suzuki

Mauro, Alison Reid, A. W. Russ, Judith M. Sweet, Lyle Yates

Henry, John Kasser, Barbara S. Uehling

California, University of, Santa Cruz: Cori Houston

California, University of, Santa Barbara: Steven Allaback, Alice

California Institute of Technology: Daniel L. Bridges, Karen Nelson California Lutheran University: Robert Doering, Jerry H. Miller

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: A. Charles

Crabb, Marilyn McNeil, Kendrick W. Walker, Michael J. Wenzl

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Keith B. Ehrenreich,

Central Michigan University: Russ Herron, David B. Keilitz, Douglas W. Nance, John Weisenburger, Marcy Weston, Jason C. Wilkie Central Missouri State University: Ed Elliott, Paul H. Engelmann, Crista Troester Central Oklahoma, University of: Paul E. Roach, John E. Wagnon Centre College: Kitty R. Baird Chadron State College: Bradley Roy Smith Chaminade University: Rev. Raymond Malley, James E. Martin Chapman College: Penny Brush, David Currey Charleston, College of: Andrew L. Abrams, William V. Moore Charleston Southern University: Howard Bagwell, Michael Hammond. Stephen D. Hudson Chevney University of Pennsylvania: Andrew Hinson, Jesse Williams Chicago, University of: Paul Mover, Rosalie Resch, Lorna P. Straus. Thomas Weingartner Chicago State University: Albert Avant Cincinnati, University of: Nancy R. Hamant, Vincent G. Ille, Joseph A. Steger, Charles F. Taylor, George D. Wolterman Citadel, The: Walter Nadzak, Col. Gerald L. Runey, Lt. Gen. Claudius E. Watts III Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: Nancy Bekavac, David Wells Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Robert Carlson, Nancy J. Latimore, Hal R. Wassink Clark Atlanta University: Jean B. Chandler, Thomas W. Cole Jr., Willie E. Hunter Clark University (Massachusetts): Linda S. Moulton Clarkson University: William O'Flaherty Clemson University: S. Paul Aaron, Max Lennon, Nick Lomak, Dwight Rainey, Robert W. Robinson Jr., B. J. Skelton Cleveland State University: John A. Flower, Alice J. Khol. John Konstantinos, Ronald G. Schultz Coastal Carolina College of the University of South Carolina: Ronald G. Eaglin, Edgar L. Green Colby-Sawyer College: Deborah Field McGrath Colgate University: Frederick H. Dunlap, Braden Houston, Janet A. Little, V. Martin Scarano Colorado, University of, Boulder: Judith E. N. Albino, James N. Corbridge Jr., Peter C. Dietze, Bill Marolt, Roy H. Shore Colorado, University of, Colorado Springs: Jeff A. Thompson Colorado Christian University: Frank A. Evans Colorado College: Roxanne Dale, Maxwell F. Taylor Colorado School of Mines: R. Bruce Allison, John A. Hogan Colorado State University: Chuck Bell, G. James Francis, Corey Johnson Columbia University-Barnard College: Roger Lehecka, Merry L.

Ormsby, John A. Reeves

Concordia College, Moorhead: Robert J. Nick

1992 Convention Proceedings

Concordia College (New York): John A. B. Davis IV Connecticut, University of: John L. Allen, Jeff Hathaway, Patricia H. Meiser-McKnett, Noreen Morris, Lewis Perkins, Donald E. Rowe Connecticut College: Charles B. Luce Coppin State College: Ronald K. DeSouza Cornell College: David Marker, Ellen Whale Cornell University: Brian Austin, Betsy East, Laing E. Kennedy, Susan H. Murphy Cortland, State University College at: Dolores A. Bogard, Lee Roberts Creighton University: C. Timothy Dickel, George A. Grieb, Thomas N. Dartmouth College: Jo Ann Harper, Richard G. Jaeger, M. Lee Pelton, Wendy Gates Troxel Davidson College: M. Terrence Holland, John W. Kuykendall, J. B. Dayton, University of: R. Elaine Dreidame, Dennis Gerdeman, Thomas J. Westendorf Delaware, University of: John L. Burmeister, Mary Ann Hitchens, Edgar N. Johnson Delaware State College: William B. DeLauder, John C. Martin, Ulysses S. Washington Jr. Delaware Valley College: John G. Bushick Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, Jim Jordan, Kent Wyatt Denison University: Cathy Benton, F. Trevor Gamble Denver, University of: Jack McDonald, Mike Thomas, Terrence J. Toy, DePaul University: William D. Bradshaw, James Doyle, Jean Lenti DePauw University: Robert G. Bottoms Detroit Mercy, University of: John Cochrane, Kenneth Henold, Brad Dickinson College: Leslie J. Poolman District of Columbia, University of: Emma J. Best, Rosalind D. Gray, Alice M. Sykes Dowling College: Michele J. LeMoal Drake University: Michael R. Ferrari, Chris Gage, Lynn King, Lou Ann Drew University: Vernon H. Mummert Drexel University: Johnson D. Bowie, Barbara Kilgour Duke University: Tom Butters, Thomas A. Spragens Jr. Duquesne University: William P. Buzzi, Brian Colleary Earlham College: Porter G. Miller, Shanna Nolan East Carolina University: Charles L. Carr, Richard R. Eakin, Ernest East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: Richard L. DeSchriver, James E. Gilbert, Diane Husis, Carey J. Snyder

East Tennessee State University: Charles E. Clark, Janice C. Shelton East Texas State University: Margaret Harbison, Donald A. Ingold Eastern Connecticut State University: David G. Carter, Stephen Kenton, Sharlene A. Peter Eastern Illinois University: Ron Paap, Stanley G. Rives, Michael R. Ryan, Robert E. Saltmarsh, Joan K. Schmidt

Eastern Kentucky University: Robert Baugh, H. Hanly Funderburk Jr., Martha Mullins

Eastern Mennonite College: Patti S. Helton, Roger E. Mast

Eastern Michigan University: John R. Adams, Carole J. Huston. William E. Shelton, Eugene D. Smith

Eastern Montana College: Pete LeRoy, Gary Nelson

Eastern Nazarene College: Carroll F. Bradley

Eastern New Mexico University: Thurman Elder, B. B. Lees

Eastern Washington University: John Johnson, Frank E. Nelson, Pamela Parks, Richard L. Zornes

Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: James K. McDonald

Elizabeth City State University: Willie G. Shaw

Elizabethtown College: Yvonne E. Kauffman Elmhurst College: Christopher M. Ragsdale

Elon College: R. Clay Hassard, Alan J. White

Emory University: David A. Ford, Chuck Gordon, Katherine Marshall, Sandy Tillman

Emporia State University: Robert E. Glennen, Wilma Kasnic, John Rich

Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, Linda Crick, J. Robert Knott

Fairfield University: Rev. Aloysius P. Kelley, Harold Menninger, Kathryn Nantz, William P. Schimpf

Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Hallie Cohen, William T. Klika Jr.

Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Roy Danforth, Richard Panicucci

Fayetteville State University: Ralph E. Burns, Clarence White Jr. Ferris State University: Dean Davenport, Mark Kosciuszko

Florida, University of: William Arnsparger, Nicholas J. Cassisi M. D., Jeremy Foley, Ann Marie Lawler, John V. Lombardi, Martha C. Rader

Florida A&M University: Walter Reed

Florida Atlantic University: Tom Cargill, Anthony James Catanese

Florida Institute of Technology: William K. Jurgens

Florida International University: Arthur W. Herriott, Mary Alice Manella, Richard A. Young

Florida Southern College: Hal Smeltzly, Lois Webb

Florida State University: Charles W. Ehrhardt, Bob Goin, Dale W. Lick, Brian Mand, Todd Markel, Charles B. Reed, Janice M. Stocker Fontbonne College: Lee McKinney

Fordham University: Francis X. McLaughlin

32 ________1992 Convention Proceedings

Fort Hays State University: Edward H. Hammond, Thomas E. Spicer Fort Lewis College: Troy D. Bledsoe

Fort Valley State College: Douglas T. Porter Framingham State College: Lawrence P. Boyd

Francis Marion College: Gerald Griffin

Franklin and Marshall College: John Andrew, Linda E. Hopple, William A. Marshall

Franklin Pierce College: Richard L. Burns, John J. Cunningham, Bruce Kirsch

Fredonia, State University College at: Everett J. Phillips, Thomas E.

Frostburg State College: Loyal K. Park

Furman University: John M. Block, Ray Parlier

Gallaudet University: Peg Worthington

Gannon University: Howard Elwell, Charles M. Murphy Gardner-Webb College: Frank McFarland III, Jeff Tubbs

Geneseo, State University College at: William Caren, John L. Spring George Mason University: Susan A. Collins, Michael G. Emsley, Jack E. Kvancz, Margaret Smith

George Washington University: Steve Bilsky, Edward A. Caress, Robert A. Chernak, Susie Jones, Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, Mary

Georgetown University: Adam Brick, Wayne A. Knoll, Joseph C. Lang, Francis X. Rienzo

Georgia, University of: Vincent J. Dooley, Lee R. Hayley, Charles B. Knapp, Elizabeth Murphey, William M. Powell, Hoke Wilder

Georgia College: Stan Aldridge, Kurt Hofmann

Georgia Institute of Technology: Jeffrey A. Howard, Bernadette V. McGlade, James E. Murphy III, William M. Sangster

Georgia Southern College: William H. Bolen, G. Lane Van Tassell, David B. Wagner

Georgia State University: Sherman R. Day, James H. Maxey, Orby

Gettysburg College: Charles W. Winters

Glassboro State College: E. Theodore Kershner, Joy Heritage Reighn Gonzaga University: John J. Preston

Gordon College: Walter Bowman Goucher College: William J. Kaiser

Grambling State University: Wilbert Ellis, Eddie Milton Jones

Grand Canyon University: B. Keith Baker

Grand Valley State University: Joan Boand, Michael J. Kovalchik, Arend D. Lubbers

Greensboro College: Kim A. Strable Grinnell College: Diane Fairchild Grove City College: R. Jack Behringer

Guilford College: J. Phillip Roach

Gustavus Adolphus College: James M. Malmquist

Delegates and Visitors ____

Hamline University: Linda C. Delano Hampden-Sydney College: Louis F. Miller Hampton University: Lenora E. Armstrong, Ollie Bowman, Christal B. Holmes, Dennis Thomas Hartford, University of: Denise Cohen, C. Donald Cook, Lewis R. Tucker Hartwick College: Kenneth Kutler Harvard University: William J. Cleary Jr., Patricia Henry, Andrea S. Wickerham Haverford College: Penelope C. Hinckley, Gregory Kannerstein, Matthew Leighninger Hawaii, University of: Kaia Hedlund, Marilyn Moniz-Kahoohanohano, Stanley B. Sheriff, Albert J. Simone Hillsdale College: Mickey Craig, Jack H. McAvoy Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Michael J. Hanna, Ellen J. Staurowsky Hofstra University: James V. Garvey Hollins College: Lynda J. Calkins Holy Cross College: Rev. John E. Brooks, Ronald S. Perry Hope College: Anne Irwin Houston, University of: James R. Benbrook, Conrad Colbert, Rudy Davalos, David B. Keith Howard University: Steve Favors, Deborah K. Johnson, Sondra Norrell-Thomas, David C. Simmons, A. B. Williamson Humboldt State University: Dennis L. Geyer, Gladys Hewitt, Chuck Lindemenn, John Yarnall Hunter College: Robert J. Coleman Idaho, University of: Darlene Bailey, W. Harold Godwin, Gary Hunter, Elisabeth Zinser Idaho State University: Ken Bothof, Nancy Graziano, Randy Hoffman, Cornelius A. Hofman Illinois, University of, Champaign: David L. Chicoine, Mildred B. Griggs, Stanley O. Ikenberry, Karol A. Kahrs, Robert K. Todd, Richard F. Wilson, Barbara Winsett Illinois, University of, Chicago: Thomas Beckham, Marie L. Robinson, Thomas Russo, James W. Schmidt, James Stukel Illinois Benedictine College: John Ostrowski Illinois State University: Linda Herman, Albert Otto, Donna Taylor, Thomas P. Wallace, Ronald D. Wellman Illinois Wesleyan University: Barbara Cothren Indiana State University: C. Sue Davis, Brian D. Faison, John C. Jessell, Andrea Myers Indiana University, Bloomington: Clarence H. Doninger, Thomas Ehrlich, Lillian Guthrie, Isabella Hutchison, Elizabeth Kurpius, Marianne H. Mitchell, Haydn H. Murray, John W. Ryan Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Frank Čignetti, David A. DeCoster,

Vivian L. Fuller, Herman L. Sledzik Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne: Robert A. Barrett Indianapolis, University of: Kenneth D. Borden, William A. Bright Iona College: Michael T. Christy, Theodore Curtis, Timothy Murray, Iowa, University of: Robert Bowlsby, Christine H. B. Grant, W. Fred Mims, Hunter R. Rawlings III, Bonnie Slatton Iowa State University: Norman L. Boyles, J. Elaine Hieber, Martin C. Ithaca College: Robert C. Deming, Sheryl Dubetsky, Bonnie J. Gordon, Thomas C. Longin, Peter Moore Jackson State University: Melvin I. Evans, W. C. Gorden, Sadie Magee Jacksonville State University: Jerry N. Cole, Harold J. McGee Jacksonville University: Howard Cornfield, Donald O. Jacobs, Jesse S. James Madison University: O. Dean Ehlers, Janet D. Lucas, William R. Jersey City State College: Lawrence R. Schiner John Carroll University: James M. Lavin John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Susan Larkin Johns Hopkins University: Thomas P. Calder, Robert H. Scott Johnson C. Smith University: Phyllis Worthy Dawkins, Horace T. Juniata College: William F. Berrier Kalamazoo College: Marilyn A. Maurer Kansas, University of: Del Brinkman, Gene A. Budig, Robert E. Frederick, Richard Konzem Kansas State University: Jim Epps, Robert S. Krause, Milt Richards, Robert R. Snell, Jon Wefald Kean College: Glenn Hedden Keene State College: Mary V. Conway, Joanne A. Fortunato Kent State University: Paul V. Amodio, Carol Cartwright, Judy Devine, William Konnert Kentucky, University of: Virginia A. Atwood, John B. Bostick, Bob Bradley, Kathleen J. DeBoer, C. M. Newton, Charles T. Wethington Kentucky State University: Donald W. Lyons, Cassie Osborne Jr. Kentucky Wesleyan College: J. Robert Cockrum Kenyon College: Robert D. Bunnell Kıng's College: Rev. William G. Condon, John J. Dorish Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: Linda Crawshaw, David McFarland, Betty G. Wesner La Salle University: Kathleen M. McNally, Robert Mullen, Annette

La Verne, University of: Jimmy M. Paschal

Delegates and Visitors

Lafayette College: Eve Atkinson, Herman C. Kissiah, Bruce E. McCutcheon Lake Forest College: Michael E. Dau Lake Superior State University: James Fallis, Charles W. Jones Lamar University: Gary Gallup, John P. Idoux, Larry W. Spradley Lander College: Betty H. Williams Lawrence University: Richard Agness Le Moyne College: Rev. Kevin G. O'Connell, Richard W. Rockwell Lebanon Valley College: Louis A. Sorrentino Lehigh University: Karen Adams, Peter Likins, Joseph D. Sterrett Lehman College: Raymond F. Salvestrini Jr. Lewis University: Karen Lockyer, Raphael Mascari, Paul Ruddy Liberty University: Chuck Burch, Kim Graham, Mike Hall Lincoln Memorial University: Dave Hyatt Lincoln University (Missouri): Richard Cosby, Lucius Jones, Mary Beth Ochsner, Wendell G. Rayburn, David L. Shinholster Livingston University: Asa N. Green, James P. Pate, Roy Underwood Livingstone College: Delano Tucker Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Tien Lu Chu, Sharon E. Taylor, Craig D. Willis Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus: Vincent Salamone Longwood College: Thomas H. Fletcher, James C. Gussett Loras College: Robert Bierie Louisiana State University: William E. Davis, Joe Dean, Sam B. Hilliard Louisiana Tech University: Patrick P. Garrett, Daniel D. Reneau, Jerry L. Stovall Louisville, University of: Dennis Golden, Burt L. Monroe Jr., William C. Olsen, Donald C. Swain Loyola College (Maryland): Diane M. Aikens, Joseph Boylan Loyola Marymount University: Elena Bove, Margaret P. Olaveson, Rev. Thomas P. O'Malley, Brian Quinn Loyola University (Illinois): Carolyn V. O'Connell, Samuel P. Ramenofsky, Charles T. Schwarz Luther College: David T. Nelson Lynchburg College: Jack M. Toms Macalester College: Kenneth W. Andrews Maine, University of: Linwood Carville, George L. Jacobson, Michael A. Ploszek Manhattan College: Bro. Francis Bowers, Robert J. Byrnes, E. Joseph Lee, Bro. Thomas J. Scanlan Manhattanville College: Theodore H. Kolva Jr. Mankato State University: Don Amiot, Georgene Brock, Ronald L. Hybertson, Margaret R. Preska Mansfield University of Pennsylvania: Rodney C. Kelchner Marietta College: Jeanne A. Arbuckle, Debora Lazorik Marist College: Eugene Doris, Alison Sexton

1992 Convention Proceedings

Maritime College, State University of New York: James Migli Marquette University: William L. Cords, Rev. Albert J. DiUlio, Carla H. Hay, Tat Shiely Mars Hill College: Ed Hoffmeyer Marshall University: Jack Daniels, Dorothy E. Hicks, William Lee Mary Washington College: Roy Gordon, Edward H. Hegmann Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: Charles R. Brown, Michael K. Hooker, Susan Kitchen, John Kloetzel, Kathleen G. Zerrlaut Maryland, University of, College Park: Ferdinand A. Geiger, Gerald Gurney, William E. Kirwan, Betty F. Smith, Suzanne Tyler Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Henry M. Brooks, Hallie E. Maryville University of St. Louis: David R. Pierce Massachusetts, University of, Amherst: David C. Bischoff, Frank P. McInerney, Aloysius N. Rufe, Elaine Sortino, Harold J. VanderZwaag Massachusetts, University of, Boston: Mary R. Barrett Massachusetts, University of, Dartmouth: John R. Brazil, Robert A. Massachusetts, University of, Lowell: R. Wayne Edwards, Linda H. Kistler Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Jane Betts, Royce N. Flippin McNeese State University: Tommy E. Bogle, Robert G. Hayes, Robert D. Hebert Medgar Evers College: Roy Anderson Memphis State University: Charles Cavagnaro, Lynn Parkes, V. Lane Rawlins, Timothy L. Sumner, Nicholas L. White Mercer University: Benjamin S. Kelley, Bobby Pope Mercy College: Neil D. Judge Mercyhurst College: Peter J. Russo Merrimack College: Bruce Baker, Robert M. DeGregorio Jr. Mesa State College: Jay Jefferson Messiah College: Layton Shoemaker Metropolitan Štate Čollege of Denver: William Helman, Joel R. Smith Jr. Miami, University of (Florida): Edward T. Foote II, L. Douglas Johnson, David L. Maggard, Harry Mallios Miami University (Ohio): Darrell D. Hedric, Harold W. Jasper, R. C. Johnson, Paul G. Pearson, Karen Womack Michigan, University of: Percy Bates, Peg Bradley-Doppes, George W. Hoey, Jack P. Weidenbach Michigan State University: John A. DiBiaggio, Michael L. Kasavana, Kathy Lindahl, Clarence Underwood Jr. Michigan Technological University: J. Richard Yeo Middle Tennessee State University: John E. Stanford, James E. Walker Middlebury College: G. Thomas Lawson Delegates and Visitors

Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Tom Burns, Gene A. Carpenter, Gary W. Reighard, Mariorie A. Trout Millikin University: Merle W. Chapman, Harriett L. Crannell Mills College: Helen Carroll Millsaps College: George M. Harmon, Robert C. King Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Gregory Fox, Bruce M. McLeod, Patricia A. Merrier Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities: McKinley Boston, Susan Colodny, Mark Dienhart, Elayne M. Donahue, Jo-Ida C. Hansen. Nils Hasselmo, Daniel L. Meinert, Donna J. Olson, Jeff Schemmel. Robert A. Stein, Chris Voelz Mississippi, University of: Warner Alford, Kittye R. Jones, R. Gerald Turner, David K. Wells, Max W. Williams Mississippi College: John W. Legg, Terry McMillan Mississippi State University: David C. Boles, Duncan McKenzie, Walter B. Newsom, Larry O. Templeton Mississippi University for Women: Jo Spearman Mississippi Valley State University: Reginal Henderson, Charles Prophet, William W. Sutton Missouri, University of, Columbia: Joe Castiglione, Carl Settergren. Richard P. Tamburo Missouri, University of, Kansas City: J. Joseph Doerr, Floyd A. Walker Missouri, University of, Rolla: Lawrence Christensen, John T. Park Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Thomas Schnell, Denise Silvester, Charles G. Smith Missouri Southern State College: Sallie Beard, Jim Frazier, Wayne A. Harrell Missouri Western State College: Mary M. Nichols Molloy College: Robert Houlihan Monmouth College (New Jersey): Marilyn A. Larsen, Samuel H. Magill, Joan Martin Montana, University of: George M. Dennison, Robert Lindsay, William Moos, Kathy Noble Montana State University: Douglas B. Fullerton, Edward L. Hanson, Virginia Hunt Montclair State College: Holly P. Gera, Gregory L. Lockard, Irvin D. Reid Moravian College: Rocco J. Calvo, Roger H. Martin Morehead State University: C. Nelson Grote, Steve Hamilton, Keith Kappes Morningside College: Dave Dolch Morris Brown College: Greg Thompson Mount Holyoke College: Laurie Priest Mount St. Mary's College (Maryland): J. Thomas Balistrere

Mount Union College: Harold Kolenbrander, Truman D. Turnquist

Muhlenberg College: Ralph Kirchenheiter Murray State University: Don W. Kassing

Nazareth College (New York): William H. Carey Nebraska, University of, at Kearney: Dick Beechner Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Don Bryant, Robert S. Devaney, Barbara A. Hibner, James O'Hanlon, Tom Osborne, Al Papik, Graham Spanier Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Connie J. Claussen, Robert B. Flynn, Robert F. Gibson, Del D. Weber Nebraska Wesleyan University: Nancy J. Hansen Nevada, University of: Chris Ault, Joseph N. Crowley, Christopher H. Exline, Angela D. Taylor Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Paul E. Burns, Christina L. Kunzer-Murphy, Jaina Preston, Jim Weaver New England College: Mary Ellen Alger New Hampshire, University of: Gilbert Chapman, John H. Lawson, Dale F. Nitzschke, David O'Connor, Judith L. Ray New Haven, University of: Deborah Chin, William M. Leete Jr. New Jersey Institute of Technology: Jim Catalano New Mexico, University of: Robert J. Desiderio, L. F. Diehm, Linda K. Estes, R. Gary Ness, Richard E. Peck, Adolph C. Plummer New Mexico Highlands University: Robert N. Evers New Mexico State University: Karen Fey, James T. Fisher, Albert T. Gonzales, James E. Halligan New Orleans, University of: Robert W. Brown, H. Hugh Floyd, Ronald J. Maestri, Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien, Donald A. Pekarek New Rochelle, College of: Kathleen LeVache New York University: Jack E. Peckett, Daniel E. Quilty Niagara University: Michael Jankowski, Very Rev. Brian J. O'Connell Nicholls State University: Phil Greco, Mike Knight Nichols College: Thomas Cafaro, Karen Tropp Veronesi Norfolk State University: William L. Price, P. LaVerne Sweat North Adams State College: Robert N. Maust, Joseph Zavattaro North Alabama, University of: Bill Jones North Carolina, University of, Asheville: Timothy J. Dillon, Valerie M. Lemoignan, Robert D. Yearout North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Richard A. Baddour, Richard G. Hiskey, Beth Miller, John D. Swofford North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: David Goldfield, Judy W. Rose, J. H. Woodward North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: James H. Allen, Nelson E. Bobb, Harold G. Hall III, David B. Knight, William E. Moran, Loren Schweninger, James R. Wyatt. North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: Charles L. Cahill, Pat Howey, James Leutze, Paul Miller, James C. Sabella North Carolina A&T State University: Willie J. Burden, Edward B. Fort, James A. Williams Jr. North Carolina Central University: Les Brinson, Carey Hughley, Tyronza R. Richmond, Sandra Shuler North Carolina State University: Arthur W. Cooper, Nora Lynn Finch, Delegates and Visitors _____

The state of the s

Eric Hyman, James D. Miller, Todd Turner North Carolina Wesleyan College: C. Michael Fox North Central College: Walter J. Johnson

North Dakota, University of: George W. Schubert, Terry Wanless North Dakota State University: Lynn Dorn, Robert Entzion, Allan G. Fischer, Jim Ozbun, Dan Summy

North Park College: Jerry Chaplin

North Texas, University of: Alfred F. Hurley, Steve Sloan, John Thornton, George Young

Northeast Louisiana University: Maynard M. Dolecheck, Benny Hollis, Lawson Swearingen

Northeast Missouri State University: Susie Bair, Alan R. Graham, Russell G. Warren

Northeastern Illinois University: K. Dale DeVille, Lynn Gaziano, Dennis J. Keihn, Gordon H. Lamb

Northeastern University: Kristin L. Burns, Irwin M. Cohen, Robert Culver, David Frazier, Richard Lapchick, Keith L. Lee, Robert W. McCabe

Northern Arizona University: Eugene M. Hughes, Sam F. McClanahan, Kelly L. Patton

Northern Colorado, University of: Robert L. Heiny, Susan M. Jacobson, Herman D. Lujan, Robert A. Oliver

Northern Illinois University: Robert J. Brigham, Cary Groth, Keith Hackett, John E. La Tourette, Tom Mitchell, Gerald K. O'Dell, Nancy M. Vedral

Northern Iowa, University of: John Conner, John Jermier, Jack D. Wilkinson, Sandra C. Williamson

Northern Kentucky University: Thomas J. Kearns

Northern Michigan University: Richard B. Comley, Harold Dorf, R. Thomas Peters Jr., William Vandament

Northwest Missouri State University: Virgil Albertini, Richard R. Flanagan

Northwestern State University (Louisiana): Robert A. Alost, Tynes Hildebrand, Jerry Pierce

Northwestern University: Bruce A. Corrie, Frederick Hemke, Betsy J. Mosher

Notre Dame, College of (California): Virginia Werner Babel Notre Dame, University of: Rev. E. William Beauchamp, Brian Boulac, Melissa L. Conboy, Joe O'Brien, Richard A. Rosenthal

Oakland University: Paul E. Hartman, Glenn A. Jackson Oberlin College: George Andrews, James E. Foels, Patrice A. Milkovich Occidental College: Ralph L. Amey, Lynn Mehl Ohio Northern University: Donn Bennice

Ohio State University: Phyllis J. Bailey, James L. Jones, Carol W. Kennedy, Bill Myles

Ohio University: Robert Kline, Mike Levine, Harold N. McElhaney, Peggy J. Pruitt. Shirley Slater

Ohio Wesleyan University: Richard D. Gordin, Justin Kronewetter, John A. Martin, David L. Warren

Oklahoma, University of: Donnie Duncan, Daniel G. Gibbens

Oklahoma State University: Ann Baer, John R. Campbell, James Garner, Gerald M. Lage, Marty Sargent

Old Dominion University: Mikki Flowers, James Jarrett, James V. Koch, Janis Sanchez

Oneonta, State University College at: James F. Baker, Albert H. Sosa Oregon, University of: Bill Byrne, Gary Gray, James M. O'Fallon, Barbara Walker

Oregon State University: Dutch Baughman, Michael Beachley, John V. Byrne, Patricia M. Drapela, Robert Frank, Sara E. Malueg Oswego, State University College at: Charles Davis

Otterbein College: Elmer W. Yoest

Pace University: Chris Bledsoe, Edward C. Zanato Pacific (California), University of the: Bill L. Atchley, Donald W. Bryan,

Kathleen Klein, Bob Lee Paine College: Ronnie O. Spry

Pembroke Štate University: William H. Dean, Joseph B. Oxendine, Ray Pennington

Pennsylvania, University of: D. Elton Cochran-Fikes, Nicholas D. Constan Jr., Carolyn Schlie Femovich, Sheldon Hackney, Paul R. Rubincam Jr.

Pennsylvania State University: John Bove, John J. Coyle, Susan Delaney-Scheetz, Elizabeth L. Fahey, Steve A. Garban, Joseph V. Paterno, Ellen L. Perry, James I. Tarman, Joab L. Thomas

Pennsylvania State University-Behrend College: John N. Grode, Herbert J. Lauffer

Pepperdine University: Roxanne K. Levenson, John G. Watson, Tim Wilhelm, Wayne Wright

Pittsburg State University: Donald W. Wilson

Pittsburgh, University of: John W. Blanton, John O. Bolvin, Bill Bryant, Donald M. Henderson, L. Oval Jaynes, J. Dennis O'Connor, Donna Sanft, Carol J. Sprague

Plattsburg, State University College at: Peter P. Luguri

Plymouth State College: Stephen R. Bamford Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Curtis W. Tong

Portland, University of: Joseph A. Etzel

Portland State University: Robert W. Lockwood, Roy Love, Randy Nordlof

Potsdam, State University College at: Charles Foster

Prairie View A&M University: Ronald D. Beard, Julius W. Becton Jr., Mary V. White

Presbyterian College: Calhoun F. Gault, Ken B. Orr, Thomas A.

Princeton University: Amy Campbell, Robert J. Myslik, George VanderZwaag

Delegates and Visitors _____

Principia College: E. Lawrence Gerber Providence College: John M. Marinatto, Patricia D. Nichol, Rev. James F. Quigley Purdue University: Steven C. Beering, Martha O. Chiscon, Joni Comstock, George S. King Jr., Philip E. Nelson, Glenn Tompkins Queens College (New York): Merlin Thompson, Richard Wettan Quinnipiac College: Burt Kahn Radford University: Greig Denny, Chuck Taylor, Ronald C. Witherow Jr. Ramapo College: Kenneth McBryde Randolph-Macon College: Theodore S. Keller, Helmut Werner Redlands, University of: James R. Appleton, Mickey McAulay, Christopher Walker, Greg Warzecka Regis College (Massachusetts): Judith W. Burling Regis University (Colorado): Tom Dedin, Barbara Schroeder Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte Rhode Island, University of: Robert Carothers, Eleanor R. Lemaire, Albert H. Taubman Rhode Island College: William M. Baird Rhodes College: Mike Clary Rice University: James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman, Jim Harris, Martha E. Hawthorne, John R. May, Steve Moniaci Richmond, University of: Harold W. Babb, Charles S. Boone Rider College: Curtis W. Blake, Chet Dalgewicz, Viola Udv Roanoke College: M. Scott Allison Robert Morris College: Robert D. McBee, Edward A. Nicholson, Robert W. Norberg Rochester, University of: Paul Bergett, Jeffrey Vennell, Joyce Wong Rochester Institute of Technology: Louis W. Spiotti Roger Williams College: Dwight F. Datcher Rollins College: Ed Borsoi, Gordon E. Howell Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology: Scott A. Duncan Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Frederick E. Gruninger, Francis L. Lawrence, Malcolm G. McLaren, Paul R. Vitek Rutgers University, Newark: John K. Adams, Florence A. Labenski. James H. Ramsey Sacred Heart University: Eilene C. Bertsch, Elizabeth Luckie Saginaw Valley State University: Robert T. Becker, George W. Eastland Jr.

St. Anselm College: Theodore S. Paulauskas St. Augustine's College: Wanzo F. Hendrix

St. Benedict, College of: Carol Howe-Veenstra

St. Bonaventure University: John P. McAllister, Very Rev. Neil J. O'Connell, Lawrence J. Weise

St. Cloud State University: Dianne Glowatzke, Arthur F. Grachek,

1992 Convention Proceedings

Morris Kurtz, Scott Mortrude, David Sprague St. Francis College (New York): Carlo Tramontozzi St. Francis College (Pennsylvania): Frank Pergolizzi, Deborah M. St. John's University (Minnesota): James Murphy St. John's University (New York): George R. Bisacca, Margaret Mary Fitzpatrick, John W. Kaiser, Richard J. Krempecki, Kathleen St. Joseph's College (Indiana): Frederick R. Berger St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania): Don J. DiJulia, Stephen Porth St. Lawrence University: John A. Clark St. Louis University: Linda Moore, Michael J. Ross, Deborah A. Yow St. Mary's College (California): Richard Mazzuto, William McLeod St. Mary's College (Indiana): Jo-Ann E. Nester St. Mary's College (Minnesota): Linda Anderson St. Michael's College: Edward P. Markey St. Norbert College: Larry Van Alstine St. Olaf College: James Dimick St. Paul's College: Sunday A. Adesuyi, Harold L. Williams St. Peter's College: William A. Stein St. Rose, College of: Catherine C. Haker St. Scholastica, College of: Kevin C. Snyder St. Thomas (Minnesota), University of: Jo Ann Andregg Salem State College: John D. Galaris Salisbury State University: Dawn Chamberlin, Cheryl Ish, William E. Lide, Michael P. Vienna Salve Regina University: Lynn Sheedy Sam Houston State University: Martin J. Anisman, Robert L. Case, Tom Davis, Bobby K. Marks Samford University: Stephen C. Allgood San Diego, University of: Thomas F. Burke, Thomas Innacone, Regina Sullivan, Dan Yourg San Diego State University: Robert Bingham, Reginald Blaylock, Jayne Hancock, Don Kaverman, Michael Magner, James G. Malik, Fred L. Miller San Francisco, University of: Sandee L. Hill, William J. Hogan San Francisco State University: Erwin Seibel San Jose State University: Thomas Brennan, Daniel R. Buerger, Carolyn M. Lewis, Charles Whitcomb, Mary M. Zimmerman Santa Clara University: James I. Briggs, Henry Demmert, Charles

Erekson, Amy E. Hackett, Thomas J. O'Connor

Savannah State College: William R. Davis Sr.

Scranton, University of: Gary N. Wodder

Seattle Pacific University: Wesley Lingren, Keith R. Phillips

Seton Hall University: George P. Browne, Sue C. Dilley, Laurence C. Keating Jr., Rev. Thomas R. Peterson

Shaw University: Dianthia M. Ford, Ernest L. Pickens, Keith Smith Shepherd College: J. Michael Jacobs

Delegates and Visitors _____

Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania: Anthony F. Ceddia, Jane Goss. C. William Knerr, James G. Pribula

Siena College: William J. Kirsch, Terry Reynolds

Simmons College: Sheila Brown

Simpson College: A. J. Breuklander, Shelley Scott

Skidmore College: Tim Brown

Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania: Robertha Abney, Robert N. Aebersold, William C. Lennox

Smith College: Linda C. Hackett

Sonoma State University: Ralph Barkey, Duncan E. Poland South, University of: Mary Susan L. Cushman, Willard Huyck

South Alabama. University of: Joe Gottfried, George Smith, Hal Williams

South Carolina, University of, at Aiken: Douglas R. Warrick

South Carolina, University of, Columbia: Sterling R. Brown, A. King Dixon II, William F. Putnam

South Carolina, University of, at Spartanburg: Daniel Codespoti, Olin B. Sansbury Jr.

South Carolina State College: Oscar P. Butler Jr., Willie E. Jeffries South Dakota, University of: Jack F. Doyle, George R. Horner, Mary Mock

South Dakota State University: Mylo A. Hellickson, Fred M. Oien, Robert T. Wagner

South Florida, University of: Francis T. Borkowski, Paul S. Griffin Southeast Missouri State University: Joseph H. Low Jr., Richard A. McDuffie, Kala M. Stroup

Southeastern Louisiana University: Billy Bond, Bob Butler, Tom Douple, G. Warren Smith

Southern California, University of: Margaret Gatz, Edward Lawler, Lisa Love, Michael B. McGee, Steven B. Sample, Don Winston, Dennis Yesalonia

Southern Colorado, University of: Patrick Bottini, Dan DeRose, Marcie L. Reynolds

Southern Connecticut State University: Michael J. Adanti, Louise Albrecht, Raymond W. DeFrancesco, Lawrence E. Fitzgerald, Anthony Martone

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: John J. Cody, James Hart, Margaret Matthias, Charlotte West

Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Cynthia Jones, John Meisel

Southern Indiana, University of: Donald D. Bennett, Charles J. Bertram

Southern Maine, University of: Paula D. Hodgdon, Remo H. Riciputi Southern Methodist University: Forrest Gregg, Charles Howard, A. Kenneth Pye, C. Paul Rogers III

Southern Mississippi, University of: Ralph N. Floyd Jr., Aubrey K. Lucas, Ronald G. Marquardt, H. C. McLellan, Sidney Weatherford Southern University, Baton Rouge: Marino H. Casem, Robert H.

Cobbins

Southern Utah University: Kathryn Berg, Jack Bishop, David R. Braegger, Michael Richards

Southwest Baptist University: John A. Bryant, Gary De Bauche, Stephanie Miller, Rodney A. Oglesby

Southwest Missouri State University: Larry L. George, Marshall Gordon, Bill O'Neill, Gregory P. Onstot, Bill Rowe, Mary Jo Wynn Southwest Texas State University: Michael Abbott, Dana L. Craft,

Jerome H. Supple

Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Gerard L. St. Martin, Nelson J. Schexnayder Jr.

Springfield College: Edward Bilik, Scott Nichols

Stanford University: Edward Leland, Cheryl L. Levick, Jerry I. Porras Staten Island, College of: Joseph Barresi

Stephen F. Austin State University: Jimmy Allison, Sadie Allison, David Batson, Matt Fenley, Steve McCarty, Baker Pattillo

Stetson University: Robert J. Jacoby, Elizabeth J. Schumaker

Stevens Institute of Technology: Frank J. Rotunda

Stillman College: Cordell Wynn

Stockton State College: G. Larry James

Stony Brook, State University of New York: Paul J. Dudzick, Sandra R. Weeden

Suffolk University: James E. Nelson

Susquehanna University: Connie Harnum, Donald Harnum

Swarthmore College: Sue Davis, Robert E. Williams

Sweet Briar College: Bonnie Kestner

Syracuse University: David H. Bennett, John J. Crouthamel, Louis G. Marcoccia, Doris R. Soladay

Tampa, University of: Hindman Wall

Temple University: Joseph W. Marshall, Charles Theokas, Miechelle O. Willis

Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: Edward G. Farrell, Frederick W. Obear, Paul J. Watson

Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Joan C. Cronan, Douglas A. Dickey, Dru Ann Hancock, Malcolm C. McInnis Jr., Philip A. Scheurer

Tennessee, University of, Martin: Ernest W. Blythe Jr., Don McLeary Tennessee State University: Lula S. Collier, William Thomas

Tennessee Technological University: Thurston E. Banks

Texas, University of, at Arlington: Pete Carlon, Bill Reeves, Bill Ross Texas, University of, at Austin: William H. Cunningham, DeLoss Dodds, Donna A. Lopiano, James W. Vick

Texas, University of, at El Paso: Brad W. Hovious, Robert D. Tollen Texas, University of, Pan American: Miguel A. Nevarez, Sam R. Odstrcil, Jerry L. Pulley

Texas, University of, at San Antonio: Daniel O. Hogenauer, Samuel A. Kirkpatrick, Bobby Thompson

Delegates and Visitors

Texas A&I University: Kay Clayton Texas A&M University: Thomas W. Adair, John David Crow, William H. Mobley, Karl P. Mooney, Tedi Zalesky Texas Christian University: Carolyn Dixon, Joseph W. Helmick, Frank Windegger Texas Southern University: Willie Criddle, William H. Harris, Porter Robinson Jr., W. Curtis Williams Texas Tech University: T. Jones, Robert W. Lawless, Jeannine McHanev, Taylor McNeel, Robert M. Sweazy Texas Woman's University: Diana Everett, Joanne Kuhn, G. Ann Uhlir, Frank Vitro Thiel College: John Dickason Thomas More College: Victor A. Clark Toledo, University of: Allen R. Bohl, James M. Klein, Tim Selgo, Marnie W. Swift Towson State University: Annette Ezell, Bill Hunter, Nance Reed, Hoke L. Smith, Jay Stanley Trenton State College: Kevin A. McHugh Trinity College (Connecticut): Richard J. Hazelton, Robin L. Sheppard Trinity University (Texas): Scott T. Chapman, Julie Jenkins, Gene Norris Troy State University: Jack Hawkins Jr., Doug Patterson, Frank B. Williams Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo Tulane University: Anne S. Barbour, Noreen Carrocci, Milton Fingerman, Eamon Kelly, Gary R. Roberts, Kevin M. White Tulsa, University of: Diane Dickman, Rick Dickson, Robert H. Donaldson, Barry A. Kinsey, Dale McNamara Tuskegee University: James A. Martin U.S. Air Force Academy: James C. Andrus, Col. Robert B. Giffen, Lt. Gen. Bradley C. Hosmer, Ken Schweitzer U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Ray Cieplik U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Susan Petersen Lubow U.S. Military Academy: Brig. Gen. Gerald E. Galloway, Lt. Gen. Howard D. Graves, Capt. Sally Jo Hall, Col. Albert Vanderbush U.S. Naval Academy: Jack Lengyel, Rear Adm. Tom C. Lynch, Richard D. Mathieu Union College (New York): Richard S. Sakala Upper Iowa University: Ralph L. McKay Upsala College: Michael J. Walsh Ursinus College: Adele P. Boyd, Robert R. Davidson Utah, University of: Fern Gardner, Larry R. Gerlach, Peter Hart, Christopher P. Hill, Arthur K. Smith Utah State University: E. Kaye Hart, Michael Parent, Rod Tueller Utica College: Michael K. Simpson, James A. Spartano Valdosta State College: Herb Reinhard, Charles R. Tucker

_____ 1992 Convention Proceedings

Valparaiso University: Bruce Berner, William L. Steinbrecher Vanderbilt University: Paul J. Hoolahan, Charles A. Kiesler, June Stewart, Joe B. Wyatt Vassar College: Valerie Cushman, Andrew M. Jennings Vermont, University of: Rosalind E. Andreas, Richard A. Farnham, Sally Guerett, Denis E. Lambert Villanova University: Ted Aceto, Ted R. Aceto, Mary Anne Dowling, Daniel T. Regan Virginia, University of: W. James Copeland, D. Alan Williams, Dennis Womack Virginia Commonwealth University: Deborah L. Cowles, Alfreeda Goff, Richard L. Sander, Eugene P. Trani Virginia Military Institute: Davis Babb, Col. Thomas W. Davis, John W. Knapp, Chip Smith Virginia Polytechnic Institute: David T. Braine, Stephen J. Horton, Larry N. Killough, Sharon L. McCloskey, James D. McComas Virginia State University: Andrea R. Carter, Arnold R. Henderson, Paulette Walker Johnson Virginia Union University: James F. Battle Virginia Wesleyan College: Donald M. Forsythe Wabash College: F. Sheldon Wettack Wagner College: Walter C. Hameline Wake Forest University: Thomas K. Hearn Jr., Gene E. Hooks, Edwin G. Wilson Wartburg College: Darold M. Wolff Washburn University of Topeka: Larry D. Blumberg, Janet M. Degginger, Richard A. Johanningmeier Washington, University of: Richard J. Dunn, Catherine B. Green, Barbara A. Hedges Washington and Lee University: Cinda L. Rankin, Michael F. Walsh Washington College (Maryland): Diane Guinan, Geoffrey M. Miller Washington State University: Barbara Bonace, Brady Crook, Jim Livengood, Clarence A. Ryan, Marcia L. Saneholtz, Samuel H. Smith Washington University (Missouri): Philip Godfrey, Lynn Stockman Imergoot, John M. Schael Wayne State College (Nebraska): Peter Chapman Wayne State University (Michigan): Bob V. Brennan, Dorothy E. Dreyer, Christ Petrouleas Weber State University: Richard Hannan, Jeff Livingston, Leland Sather, Paul H. Thompson Wellesley College: Carolyn Campbell, Louise O'Neal Wentworth Institute of Technology: Lee Conrad Wesleyan University: John S. Biddiscombe, Gale Lackey West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Reginald Nealy, Cynthia E. Ryder, John C. Tachovsky West Liberty State College: David C. Brooks West Texas State University: Michael Chandler Delegates and Visitors _____

West Virginia University: Ed Pastilong, Jon A. Reed, Craig Walker Western Carolina University: Fred Cantler, Myron L. Coulter, Betty J. Peele, Bobby N. Setzer, C. Claude Teagarden Western Connecticut State University: Edward Farrington Western Illinois University: James E. McKinney, Gil Peterson, Helen Smilev Western Kentucky University: Pam Herriford, William G. Kummer, Louis Marciani, Thomas C. Meredith, Kelly Carole Smith Western Maryland College: J. Richard Carpenter Jr. Western Michigan University: Kathy B. Beauregard, Chauncey J. Brinn, Leland Byrd, Greg Dobson, Adrian Edwards, Diether Haenicke Western State College of Colorado: Curt Mallory, Clifford A. Nancarrow Westfield State College: Ronald Applbaum, F. Paul Bogan Wheaton College (Illinois): Tony Ladd Wheaton College (Massachusetts): Chad Yowell Whittier College: Sherry Calvert, David A. Jacobs Wichita State University: Warren Armstrong, Martin M. Perline, Tom Shupe Widener University: Bruce Bryde, Adelene Malatesta William and Mary, College of: Barbara Blosser, John H. Randolph William Paterson College: Arthur Eason Williams College: Robert R. Peck Wingate College: Robert D. Billinger Jr. Winston-Salem State University: Lynn Berry, Arnold Lockett, Albert L. Roseboro, Cleon F. Thompson Winthrop College: Robert H. Breakfield, Thomas N. Hickman Wisconsin, University of, Eau Claire: Carol L. Klun, Marilyn Skrivseth Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Otis Chambers, Charles A. Ihrke, David L. Outcalt, Daniel J. Spielmann Wisconsin, University of, La Crosse: Bridget Belgiovine, Gale Grimslid, Douglas N. Hastad Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Margaret Davey, James Hoyt, Cheryl A. Marra, Joel Maturi, Pat Richter, Donna E. Shalala Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Bud K. Haidet, William A. Raabe Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: Allen F. Ackerman, John Kerrigan, Marilyn Potter Wisconsin, University of, Parkside: Linda Draft, John C. Stockwell Wisconsin, University of, River Falls: Elizabeth J. Oostendorp Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point: Sonja Kung, Frank O'Brien, Nancy Page Wisconsin, University of, Stout: Joseph Costine, Rita Slinden Wisconsin, University of, Superior: Steve Becker Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: Dianne Jones Wittenberg University: Jeff Ankrom, Linda L. Arena, Virginia H. Lucas, Robert E. Rosencrans Wofford College: Daniel B. Morrison Jr. Wooster, College of: Gordon Collins, William D. McHenry, Nan Nichols Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Raymond R. Gilbert, Jon C. Strauss

A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O

Worcester State College: Susan E. Chapman Wright State University: Michael J. Cusack, Charles J. Hartmann, Paige E. Mulhollan, Peggy L. Wynkoop Wyoming, University of: Robert Cochran, Joseph R. Geraud, Paul L. Xavier University (Ohio): Jeffrey H. Fogelson, Laurie J. Massa, Janice Yale University: Colleen Lim, Harold E. Woodsum Jr., Mark T. Young York College (Pennsylvania): Jeffrey L. Gamber Youngstown State University: Robert C. Campbell, Joseph F. Malmisur, Pauline N. Saternow **Conference Members** Atlantic Coast Conference: Eugene F. Corrigan, Thomas P. Mickle, David V. Thompson, DeLores S. Todd Atlantic 10 Conference: Ron Bertovich, Cindy Mazda Big East Conference: Linda M. Bruno, Thomas McElroy, Michael A. Big Eight Conference: Prentice Gautt, Carl C. James Big Sky Conference: Ronald D. Stephenson Big South Conference: Tom Collins, George F. Sasser Big Ten Conference: James E. Delany, Phyllis L. Howlett, Carol Big West Conference: Dennis A. Farrell, James Haney, Jody McRoberts, Paula Y. Smith California Collegiate Athletic Association: Bill Husak, Pat Morgan, Tom D. Morgan Capital Athletic Conference: Ed Hegmann *Central Collegiate Hockey Association: Bill Beagan Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Patrick Carter, Leon G. Kerry, Martha Marcolini City University of New York Athletic Conference: Ted Hurwitz College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin: Jack Swartz Colonial Athletic Association: Timothy Franklin, Kathleen Hallock, Thomas E. Yeager Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Donald L. Scalf East Coast Conference: John B. Carpenter Eastern College Athletic Conference: Joseph Bertagna, Clayton W. Empire Athletic Association: Bruce Mosberg Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference: Patricia Viverito Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Vern L. Norris Great Lakes Valley Conference: Kenneth A. Lindsey Great Midwest Conference: Michael L. Slive, Kathryn M. Statz, *Great Northwest Conference: Elwood B. Hahn

Delegates and Visitors _____

Gulf South Conference: G. E. Moran Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: John Van Why Ivy Group Presidents, Council of: Constance Hurlbut, Suzanne Jones, Jeffrey H. Orleans Lone Star Conference: Robert L. Ziegler Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: John D. Galaris Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Barbara Church, Richard J. Ensor Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph McFillen, R. Dale Smith Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Sheila K. Wallace Kovalchik Mid-American Athletic Conference: Karl D. Benson, E. James McCloskev Mid-Continent Conference: Jerry A. Ippoliti, Jon A. Steinbrecher Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Larry Barber, Kenneth A. Free Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: Michael Altman, Nathan N. Salant Midwest Athletic Conference for Women: Diane Fairchild Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph L. Shively *Midwest Intercollegiate Football Conference: William L. Sylvester Midwestern Collegiate Conference: Daniel B. DiEdwardo, Bret A. Gilliland Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Ken B. Jones Missouri Valley Conference: J. Douglas Elgin New England Collegiate Conference: Joanne A. Fortunato New England Women's 8: Barbara Bickford New Jersey Athletic Conference: Sabrina Grant New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association: Dolores A. Bogard North Atlantic Conference: Stuart P. Haskell Jr. North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Noel W. Olson North Coast Athletic Conference: Dennis M. Collins North Star Conference: Phyllis I. Holmes Northeast Conference: Chris Monasch Northeast-10 Conference: Robert E. Burke, Elwood N. Shields, William C. Sullivan Northern California Athletic Conference: James P. Jorgensen Ohio Athletic Conference: Timothy W. Gleason Ohio Valley Conference: R. Daniel Beebe, Jon Verner Old Dominion Athletic Conference: Daniel E. Wooldridge Pacific-10 Conference: Thomas C. Hansen, Christine W. Hoyles, Mike Matthews, David Price Patriot League: Carl F. Ullrich Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference: Charles A. Eberle Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference: Kurt Patherg South Atlantic Conference: Doug Echols Southeastern Conference: John R. Gerdy, Roy Kramer, James L. McCullough, Sonya Varnell, Patricia W. Wall, Mark Womack

Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Joseph L. Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference: Stephen P. Argo Southern Conference: Julie Brittenum, Tom Hunnicutt, Wright Waters, Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Cynthia R. Hill, Wallace Southland Conference: Bill Belknap, Don Graham, Greg Sankey Southwest Athletic Conference: Allen Archer, Britton Banowsky, Rick Chryst, Fred H. Jacoby, Kelly Krauskopf Southwestern Athletic Conference: James Frank State University of New York Athletic Conference: Patrick R. Damore, Sun Belt Conference: Robert J. Bernardi, John Iamarino, Craig Sunshine State Conference: Bob Vanatta, John F. Wendel Trans America Athletic Conference: William C. Bibb, Stephen E. University Athletic Association: Richard Rasmussen West Coast Conference: Michael M. Gilleran, Don Ott, Jana M. Steel Western Athletic Conference: Jeff Hurd, Joseph L. Kearney, Margie *Western Collegiate Hockey Association: Otto Breitenbach *Western Football Conference: Victor A. Buccola, Don Wilson *Western Intercollegiate Volleyball Association: Robert L. Newcomb Wisconsin State University Conference: Max R. Sparger Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Judy Kruck-Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Kitty R. Baird *Nonvoting

Affiliated Members $American \ Association \ of \ Collegia te \ Registrars \ and \ Admissions \ Officers:$ American Baseball Coaches Association: Dick Bergquist American Volleyball Coaches Association: Sandra L. Vivas Black Coaches Association: Leah C. Lewis Blockbuster Bowl: Keith R. Tribble College Football Association: Charles M. Neinas College Swimming Coaches of America, Inc.: Jim Richardson Golf Coaches Association of America: James H. Cook, John Means Independent Football Officials Alliance: Jim Campbell, T. R. Ruta, Richard Sands, Tommy Taylor Metropolitan Intercollegiate Basketball Association: John J. Powers National Association of Basketball Coaches: Joseph R. Vancisin National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Delegates and Visitors _____

National Soccer Coaches Association of America: Johnson D. Bowie National Softball Coaches Association: Rayla Allison NCAA DivisionI Track and Field Coaches Association: Gary K. Schwartz

U.S. Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association: Louis W. Spiotti

U.S. Olympic Committee: Charles Davis, Charles J. Dillman, Curt L. Hamakawa, Dave Ogrean

U.S. Volleyball Association: Debbie Hunter

USA Basketball: William L. Wall

Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Anne E. Flannery, Betty Jaynes, Cozette Wallace

Women's Intercollegiate Cross Country Coaches Association: Louis J. Duesing Jr.

Corresponding Members

Apprentice School: William G. Casto

Athletes in Action: Dave Lower, Scott D. Oppliger, Sharm Scheuerman Brigham Young University (Hawaii): Norman A. Kaluhiokalan, David A. Slack

Hawaii, University of, Hilo: Bill Trumbo

New York Institute of Technology: Clyde Doughty Jr.

North Florida, University of: John C. Ratliff Oral Roberts University: Robert T. Brooks

Southwestern University (Texas): Carla Lowry, Roy B. Shilling Jr.

Wesleyan College (Georgia): Boyd Schoeller

Visitors

Abrams, Jeffrey

Thinks to the second of the se

Alderson-Broaddus College: Allen M. Cassell

American Association of State Colleges and Universities: James B. Appleberry

American Council on Education: Sheldon E. Steinbach

Andrus Group, The: Sharon Andrus

Association of Governing Boards: Robert L. Gale

Berry College: Bret Simon

Birmingham Football Foundation, Inc.: Jim Simmons

Bond, Schoeneck & King: Thomas S. Evans, Michael S. Glazier, Kathy Jones

Bonner, Francis W.

Capital Centre/Centre Group: Bob Zurfluh

Central Arkansas, University of: Arvil Burks, Bill Stephens

Drury College: Bruce Harger

Fairtron Corp.: Ken Krogman, Clyde Walker Fiesta Bowl: Chuck Johnson, John Junker

Fleishman-Hillard, Inc.: Jonelle Birney, John Overstreet

Florida Citrus Bowl: Bob Moore, Chuck Rohe

Hanover College: Dick Naylor

_______1992 Convention Proceedings

Harsh, Emily H.

Henderson State University: Charles D. Dunn Hendrix College: John Churchill, Bob Courtway

Isaacson, Terry C.

Jarvis Christian College: Sebetha Jenkins, Joe Nimock, Frank Perry

Kazmaier Associates: Terry Driscoll, Richard Kazmaier, Bob Ruxin Knight Commission on Athletics: Maureen E. Devlin, John Griffin, Christopher B. Morris

Knight Foundation: Creed Black, James Harvey

Kulis, Rick

Liberty Bowl Football Classic: A. F. Dudley Lipsky & Lipsky: Ronald Lipsky, Stuart Lipsky

Mazzone, Angelo

Meadowlands Sports Complex: Michael Graime, Helen Strus Misericordia, College of: Scott J. Kalicki, Michael W. Mould Molton, Allen & Williams Corporation: William M. Jacka

Moreno, Tony Narol, Melvin S.

National Rifle Association: Margaret Schoap

Northwood Institute: Dave Coffey Oahu Travel Inc.: Pam Goodman Orange Bowl Committee: Steve Lynch

Pasadena Tournament of Roses: Del Beckhart, Jack Biggar, Bob Cheney, Harriman Cronk, Don Fedde, Stan Hahn, Gary Hayward, Fred Johnson, Fred Soldwedel

Ramsey, Tom

Sara Lee Corporation: Becky Folds, Joselyn Williams Savannah College of Art and Design: Richard G. Rowan Sarni, Michael

Smith, Ron

Spectator Management Group: Bill Curl

Sports Perspectives International: Charles S. Farrell, Oscar Rider

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey: Michael Scott

Tele Planning International, Inc.: Sally Behrhorst, Blair Elliott, Hizuki Ham, Michihito Jinno, Kunimasa Matsuda, Masaru Yanaka Travel Resources: Bob Getchell

U.S. House of Representatives: Donovan L. Gay

U.S. Senate: Dick Damato, Khalil Munir Wayland Baptist University: Greg Feris

West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Barry Blizzard

West Virginia State College: Gregory K. P. Smith West Virginia Wesleyan College: George A. Klebez

Westminster College: Terry Logue

Working News Media

ABC Radio Sports: Liz Shanov ABC Sports: Tony Petitti, Steve Solomon

Delegates and Visitors

Akron Beacon Journal: Tom Giffen Amusement Business: Linda Deckard Anchorage Daily News: Michael Itagaki Anchorage Times: Ken Sain, Spencer Weiner

Ann Arbor News: John Beckett

Arizona Daily Wildcat: Brian Jaramillo

Associated Press: Ken Peters, Joe Resnick, Doug Tucker

Atlanta Journal-Constitution: David Davidson Baton Rouge Morning Advocate: George Morris

Cable News Network: Joel Hartway, Andy McKinney, Luis Rios

CBS News: Ron Allen, Hunter Bloch, Barbara Pierce

CBS Sports: Len DeLuca, Jay Rosenstein Chicago Tribune: Andy Bagnato, Ed Sherman Chronicle of Higher Education: Doug Lederman College Football Hall of Fame: Pat Harmon

Daily Breeze: Bill Cizek

Daily Cardinal: Mike Bresnahan Daily Evergreen: Winda Benedetti

Dallas Morning News: Doug Bedell, Ivan Maisel

Dayton Daily News: Ritter Collett Des Moines Register: Buck Turnbull Detroit Free Press: Steve Kornacki

Detroit News: Fred Girard Education Week: Mark Pitsch

ESPN: Mike Aresco, Steve Bornstein, Dave Brown, Michael McQuade, Tom Ojakjian, Mark Schwarz, Jeff Spencer

Fox Television: Tom Baker

Host Creative Communications: A. Bray Cary, Pete Derzis, W. James Host, James Loving

Houston Chronicle: Jonathan Feigen Jackson Clarion-Ledger: Mike Knobler

John Crowe Productions: Dan Berlin, Mitch Bird, Doug Crosby, Johnny Fortune, Bob Janeway, Brian McConnell, Robert Menschel, Chris

Parris, Bob Robinson, Brad Sheldon, Alex Trence

Kansas City Star: Adam Teicher

KCAL-TV: Marc Watts KDOC-TV: Beth Bingham KFWB: Sharon Katchen KLON-FM: Frank Stoltze KNX Newsradio: Mike Landa

KTUU-TV: Barry Johnson, John Murnan

KVBC-TV: Dan Burns, Mark Guranik, Brett Wood

Landmark News Service: Bill Brill

Las Vegas Sun: Steve Carp

Los Angeles Daily News: Lisa Dillman, Eric Sondheimer Los Angeles Times: Elliott Almond, Bill Dwyre, Danny Robbins

Memphis Commercial Appeal: Al Dunning

Miami Herald: Ken Rodriguez, Jack Wheat

_ 1992 Convention Proceedings

Michigan Daily: Theodore Cox New York Times: Mike Martinez

Newsday: Tim Layden

Omaha World-Herld: Dennis Dodd

Orange County Register: Janis Carr, Steve Fryer, Michele Himmelberg,

Oregonian: Ken Goe

Philadelphia Inquirer: Michael G. Missanelli Raleigh News & Observer: Chip Alexander

Raycom Sports Inc.: Ken Haines, Terry Hanson, Mike Lude, Chuck

Richmond Times-Dispatch: Jerry Lindquist

San Diego Tribune: Frank Brady San Diego Union: Tom Maloney Scottsdale Progress: John Prather

Scripps Howard News Service: Thomas O'Toole

Sports Law Update: Mike Stone

Sports Illustrated: William F. Reed, Shelley Smith

Tacoma News Tribune: Don Borst Tampa Tribune: Tom McEwen Tucson Citizen: Corky Simpson

Turner Broadcasting System: Bob Dickinson, Kevin O'Malley, John D.

United Press International: Mike Barnes

USA Today: Fred Baer, Debbie Becker, Steve Wieberg

Washington Post: Mark Asher WILL-AM: David Dickey

Yomiuri Shimbun: Uchiro Suyama, Chiaki Suzuki

Delegates and Visitors

86th Annual Convention **Opening Business Session**

Tuesday Afternoon, January 7, 1992

The 86th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held at the Anaheim Hilton and Towers, Anaheim, California, was called to order at 4:30 p.m., with President Judith M. Sweet, director of athletics, University of California, San Diego, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

President Sweet: I would like to call to order the 86th Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the 1992 NCAA Convention in Southern California.

As we begin to review Convention procedures, I want to emphasize the tremendous opportunity that is available to us over the next couple of days. We have the opportunity to take the next step in what has become known as the reform movement. We have the opportunity to make intercollegiate athletics better than it might otherwise be and to better fit within higher education. I hope that we take advantage of this opportunity.

As you know, our meetings are conducted under the procedures prescribed by Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. We are fortunate to again have the services of Alan Chapman, who will serve as parliamentarian for the 18th straight year, and no one is happier about that than I am. One of our procedures is the need to adopt the Convention Program prior to beginning our business. I now will ask for a motion to adopt the printed program of this Convention so we may proceed.

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): I move adoption of the printed program.

[The motion was seconded.]

Douglas S. Hobbs (University of California, Los Angeles): I move the reordering of Proposal No. 16 to be placed ahead of No. 15.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Joseph S. Boland (Auburn University): Since Propositions 30 and 67 both deal with financial aid to student-athletes during the summer prior to their initial year of enrollment, they should likely be considered consecutively. It is my understanding that the passage of Proposition 67 would make Proposition No. 30 moot. I move that Proposition No. 67

be considered immediately prior to Proposition No. 30.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

John Good (Wesleyan University): I move that Proposal No. 32 be reordered to precede Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[The Convention Program was adopted as reordered.]

President Sweet: Robert's Rules of Order provides that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such procedures, and several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of your Convention Notice. The NCAA's Convention procedures are designed to assure fairness and equitable treatment for all members, as well as to eliminate any questions of propriety and to expedite your work as delegates. I will not take the time today to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to assure fairness. I remind the delegates, however, that the chair fully intends to apply those procedures throughout.

We will, for example, be aware of the number of times an individual speaks on a given issue and the length of the time taken by any one speaker, both matters controlled by Robert's. Also Robert's says any motion to table that is designed to prevent debate or to kill a motion, is dilatory and thus will be ruled out of order. Only a two-thirds majority of this body can suppress debate on any circularized proposal. There are certain other procedures we employ in attempting to use our time efficiently. In all of the business sessions, the chair will attempt to "eyeball" as many votes as possible, calling for a count by the Voting Committee only when there is doubt as to the majority. I ask delegates to refrain from calling for a vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue.

On bylaw issues in the general business session, the chair will call for the vote in the same division sequence each time: Division I first, then Division II and then Division III. The results of a division's vote will not be announced until all divisions have voted. Please remember that NCAA procedures require all votes to be by paddle, or roll call when indicated, and not by voice or show of hands.

Each active member institution may have four accredited delegates, one voting and three alternates. They may exchange the voting privilege among them because all have been approved as voters by the chief executive officer of the institution. Active members also may have visiting delegates, but those visitors may not participate in the Convention in terms of speaking or voting. Member conferences that have voting privileges in accordance with the constitution have the same voting and speaking rights as active members. A member conference or any affiliated organization that does not have a vote may have one official delegate who is permitted to speak but not vote.

This is the fourth Convention for the "window of reconsideration" approach. In the general business session Thursday afternoon, immediately after we act on the consent package, I will call for any motions

Opening	Business	Session	
---------	----------	---------	--

to reconsider anything adopted by the division business sessions. That will be the only time that a division decision from its separate session can be reconsidered in the general business session. All reconsideration motions involving actions in the division business sessions must occur either in those division sessions or in the "window of reconsideration" Thursday afternoon.

CONVENTION COMMITTEES

President Sweet: It now is my privilege to identify the Convention committees and the chair of each. The Nominating Committee, David A. Jacobs, Whittier College. The Men's Committee on Committees, Daniel G. Guerrero, California State University, Dominguez Hills. The Women's Committee on Committees, Carolyn Dixon, Texas Christian University. The Voting Committee, Katherine E. Noble, University of Montana. The Credentials Committee, Paul H. Brand, University of Alabama, Huntsville. The Memorial Resolutions Committee, Laurie Priest, Mount Holyoke College.

REPORT OF COUNCIL

President Sweet: In accordance with NCAA procedures, sports committee and general committee reports are not presented orally but are included in NCAA Annual Reports, which is available at the registration desk for each member institution and member conference. The secretary-treasurer report and that of the Executive Committee also appear in Annual Reports. At the beginning of the general business session Thursday afternoon, we will entertain motions to receive and approve these reports.

We move now to the report of the NCAA Council for 1991. To present that report, I am pleased to introduce a Council member whose term is ending with this Convention. He has been a valuable member of the Council. It is reassuring to know that he will continue to chair the committees working on certification and on legislative procedures, and that he will continue to serve on the Presidents Commission. I am honored to present to you Joseph N. Crowley, president of the University of Nevada, for the report of the Council and a status report on the certification process, as mandated by last year's Convention.

Joseph N. Crowley (University of Nevada): Judith, thank you very much. Members of the Association, I am honored to present this report of the 1991 Council, as indeed I have been honored to serve as a member of the Council during the last five years.

The past year has been one of unusually far-reaching involvements for the Council and I consider myself to be privileged to have played some small role in the activity of the Council this year. The report that I give to the 1992 Convention, which is mandated by the constitution of the Association, is intended in part to give the membership an opportunity to challenge any of the Council's actions during the past year. My presentation, I hasten to add, is only a summary. However, it does incorporate by reference the full report of all Council actions during the year.

That reference specifically is as follows: First, The NCAA News publishes the actual minutes of each Council meeting and you are thus informed in timely fashion of all Council actions. In 1991, those minutes were printed in the News issues dated March 6 and 13, May 29, September 23 and November 25. Secondly, NCAA Annual Reports contains abridged minutes of Council meetings for the past year. That book is distributed at the Convention and is also mailed to each member of the Association. In those two sources, you will find every Council action of the past year.

Another important procedural aspect of this Council report is to call attention to certain legislative actions taken by the Council. I refer you to three appendices in your Convention Official Notice: First, Appendix E in the Official Notice sets forth the interpretations that the Legislative Review Committee intends to incorporate in the next printing of the NCAA Manual. Those incorporations have been approved by the Council. In Appendix E, you have the procedure for accepting or challenging the inclusion of any of these interpretations in the Manual. If any delegate wishes to object to incorporation of any such interpretation, this would be the time to do so. There appear to be no such challenges.

Second, Appendix F sets forth the noncontroversial legislative amendments that the Council has adopted in 1991. The Council has the authority to adopt noncontroversial amendments between Conventions, and it used that authority 14 times in the past year. Those are presented in Appendix F. Again, acceptance of or challenge to those actions can occur at this time. So, if any delegate wishes to object to any of the amendments in Appendix F, now would be the time to do so. Again, there appear to be no challenges.

Third, Appendix G presents six cases in which the Council has used its authority to modify the wording of legislation based on a showing of its original intent. Any objection or challenge should occur now. There appear to be no challenges.

That concludes the procedural aspect of this Council report. Substantively, I want to emphasize again what an important time this is in intercollegiate athletics and what significant activities we are involved in. During the past year, the Council has followed closely the intensive study of the enforcement and infractions process by the special committee chaired by President Rex Lee. We are well into the preparation for a mandatory athletics certification program, and I will comment a bit more on that shortly.

We have a special committee, which I am also involved with, looking at ways of streamlining our legislative procedures. Under Dick Schultz's leadership, we are making strides toward the day when we will do a better job of telling the positive stories of intercollegiate athletics. And there are many positive stories to tell. Certainly at the forefront of all of this, the Council continues to work very, very closely with the Association's Presidents Commission, on which I also have the privilege of serving, and continuing the Commission's reform agenda.

We have to realize that it is imperative that the movement toward reform reaches fruition, lest those outside higher education take charge in telling us how we are going to operate. And some are waiting at the gates.

I think it is appropriate to recognize the outstanding leadership provided in the last year by R. Gerald Turner as chair of the Presidents Commission. It has been an honor to serve under him. While he was eligible, unfortunately, to serve only one year in that post, he has provided solid leadership and guidance and has been an effective spokesman for the Commission's efforts to deal with the problems in intercollegiate athletics. He certainly has been an asset to the Council.

As you know if you follow the reports of the Council's meetings, it spends much of its time throughout the year dealing with the nitty-gritty—the detailed matters of interpretations, legislation, membership petitions and requests, various committee actions, and the other types of activity that are necessary to the effective conduct of the Association's business between Conventions. I know that we are improving the Council's procedures in dealing with those types of matters and I believe that the Council is moving toward the day when it will be able to spend more of its time on the substantive issues in college athletics and its essential relationship to higher education.

President Sweet, I am now going to conclude this summary report of the 1991 Council. Thursday afternoon, when the general business session convenes at 1:30, there will be a motion for the Convention to accept and approve the Council's full report. I trust that motion will be passed. On behalf of the Council, I thank you for listening.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON CERTIFICATION

Joseph N. Crowley (University of Nevada): If I may, I will take a few more minutes to present a status report on the development of the certification program. This report was mandated by last year's Convention. That Convention resolved that a progress report be presented in 1992 to this Convention concerning the pilot certification program in Divisions I and II and that legislation be submitted for consideration at the 1993 Convention to establish a mandatory certification program if the Council determines such action to be appropriate. So in April after that resolution, the Council established the Subcommittee on Certification to evaluate the pilot program to report to this Convention and to recommend legislation for the next Convention. I have the privilege of chairing that committee.

We have spent a good deal of time at the task. We have had a lot of meetings. We have had hearings. We have had written submissions. And in preparing our reports, we have evaluated the pilot program in some depth and received written evaluations submitted by each of the institutions participating in the pilot program. The subcommittee also invited written comments related to certification from chief executive officers and athletics administrators of every member institution. We received approximately 55 written submissions. We contacted each of the nation's regional accrediting agencies to try to develop a better

adina -

understanding of their activities and the relationship of those activities to certification and to receive comments from those associations. We conducted hearings in November in Dallas, at which time about 25 institutions, conferences and organizations were represented. The report I am giving today was reviewed by the Administrative Committee in December. It also was provided to Council and Presidents Commission members at their pre-Convention meetings. The full written report will be available to each Convention delegate during the general business session on Thursday.

Our subcommittee reached a number of general conclusions: that participation in certification by the larger institutional community should be a cornerstone of the program; that the administrative burden created by this program should be kept to a minimum; that an NCAA member institution should control the implementation of the program; that participation by conferences should be significant, and that the program should provide sufficient opportunity for institutions to take corrective actions when significant problems are identified during the process. As to the overall purpose of the certification, we concluded that that purpose should be to validate the fundamental integrity of the athletics programs through a verified and evaluated institutional self-study. We decided that the seven broad topic areas identified for the pilot project should be retained in any mandatory certification program.

These topic areas are institutional mission; institutional control; presidential authority; fiscal and academic integrity; the conduct of student-athletes and coaches; commitment to rules compliance, and the student-athlete experience. Within those seven areas, operating principles should be identified that are few in number and broadly defined, recognizing the membership's diversity and agreed upon by the membership. We had to go in drafting some tentative operating principles in three areas that you will find in the status report Thursday. We welcome any comments on those and any suggestions with respect to other such principles.

We concluded that peer review must be an essential part of any certification process and that that review be done by outside people. That is to say peer reviews should be done in verifying the self-study process to ensure that it has been done through a campus-wide involvement and participation, and to evaluate the institution's performance in relation to these fundamental previously agreed-to operating principles. The subcommittee recommends that rules compliance be treated as a component of certification in a somewhat different manner. We discussed this at length. We discussed the appropriate conference role and we have taken the position at least to date that the conference office should assume a more formal relationship with its member institutions in the development and coordination of rules compliance efforts.

This conclusion is outlined in the report. The subcommittee would welcome a hearing from the membership on this matter. As to the consequences, we believe that the program's goal should be to move

Opening Business Session

institutions toward certification, that the process should not be regarded principally as a punitive process, and that institutions should have an opportunity to correct any deficiencies discovered either during the self-study or during the evaluation. If the institutions, however, do not correct deficiencies after efforts have been made by conferences, the evaluating committee and the standing Committee on Certification to correct the deficiencies, then some serious consequences should result.

As to the administration of the program, responsibility would rest with the standing Committee on Certification. We believe that is where it should rest. That standing committee will be appointed by the Council and be responsible for developing and maintaining certification procedures, overseeing the selection, training and assignment of peer reviewers, establishing a schedule for certification reviewing, selfstudy reports, and rendering certification decisions.

Finally, on the administration question that the certification process should be incorporated with related programs already in place. including the parent institutional self-study, the work of this subcommittee will conclude with its report to the Council in April. We will recommend as a part of that report the creation of the special committee, continuing the terms of the members of the subcommittee and adding additional members to work on the development of legislation to ensure that we meet the purpose established for us in the resolution passed at last year's Convention.

A number of issues remain to be resolved by the subcommittee or by its successor committee. We have not, for example, yet made a determination, and again we would welcome input from the membership as to the coverage of this process, if it should be a Division I process or if it should be a process covering Divisions I and II. Division III already has indicated that it would prefer not to participate should it have been. as so suggested, simply a process to cover Division I-A. Again, your input would be welcomed. We also would appreciate suggestions about the question of funding. There are alternatives available. This is likely to be a relatively expensive program. We don't have any special wisdom as to whether it should be funded by the Association, by the membership, by some combination, whether we should begin to receive money or exactly how we ought to proceed in that regard.

Finally, I would like to say that the subcommittee is unanimously resolved that the process continue as it began and as it has been sustained thus far—as an open process. We have learned much from the hearings. We have learned much from the evaluations of the pilotproject institutions and from the written submissions of institutions, the Council, the Commission and others with whom we have discussed certification. We are resolved that we shall continue that open process so that what we have developed in the end and present to the Convention in 1993 will be something this Convention can be proud of.

Madam President, at long last I am done. Thank you. (Applause)

REPORT OF MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

President Sweet: At this point on the agenda, we will have the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. I would like to ask all delegates and our friends in the news media to please remain silent during the reading of the memorial resolutions.

Now, may I present Laurie Priest of Mount Holyoke College, the chair of the Memorial Resolutions Committee.

Laurie Priest (Mount Holyoke College): President Sweet and delegates, at this time I would like to recognize the other members of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. They are James Doyle, DePaul University, and Catherine C. Haker, College of St. Rose. Following is a listing of those men and women who have passed away during the past

Art Acker, California State University, Chico James Q. Allen, Mississippi College John Balquist, Columbia University William F. Bernlohr, Capital University Louis J. Bonder, Atlantic 10 Conference Norman R. Borg, Northern Arizona University Henry T. Bream, Gettysburg College Paul Brown, Ohio State University Milt Bruhn, University of Wisconsin, Madison M. Robert Cahill, University of Notre Dame Betty Clark, East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania Raymond Coombs, Williams College Hardin Cooper, University of Houston Vern Cox, Springfield College Cecil C. Crowley, Louisiana Tech University Paul L. Davidson, Capital University Joe DeBonis, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference Jack V. Doland, McNeese State University Owen J. Dougherty, Indiana University of Pennsylvania Joel Eaves, University of Georgia Lou Flumere, Bentley College Howard Graff, Villanova University Tony Gubicza, Villanova University Merlin Hathaway, State University of New York at Albany Herbert V. Hess, St. John's University (New York) James B. Higgins, Lamar University Howard Hobson, University of Oregon Steve Huefner, Gannon University LeRoy B. Hughes, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo William Hughes, St. Francis College (Pennsylvania) Harry James, University of Utah Robert N. Johnson, Colorado College Albert B. Jones, University of Georgia

Chris Jones, Villanova University

Opening Business Session ____

Cliff Keen, University of Michigan Herman Kluge, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee John Krause, Valparaiso University Al Lolotai, Brigham Young University, Hawaii George Lott, DePaul University Steve Lowe, University of Wisconsin, Madison Hank Majeski, Wagner College Edgar E. Miller, U.S. Naval Academy Ben Mintz, Cornell University Janet A. Napoli, University of Chicago David M. Nelson, University of Delaware Ken Oberbruner, University of Wisconsin, Parkside Eugene Oberst, John Carroll University Walter Paulison, Northwestern University Naseby Rinehart Sr. University of Montana John Rooney, Fordham University Robert B. Rutherford Jr., Pennsylvania State University Marchmont Schwartz, Stanford University George Seewagen, St. John's University (New York) Terry Slater, Colgate University Burt Smith, Michigan State University Newton B. Stults, Florida State University Billy R. Tidwell, Sam Houston State University Forrest Towns, University of Georgia Ed Weir, University of Nebraska, Lincoln Howard A. White, Pepperdine University

Please stand and observe a moment of silence for those who have gone before us. If you know of people who should be added to the list. please contact the committee or the national office staff.

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

President Sweet: We now come to a feature that we introduced at the 1988 Convention, one that has been very well received and now is an annual practice. We believe it both appropriate and important to have our executive director present an annual summary of conditions in the Association and in college athletics in general. His remarks at the last four Conventions have spurred the reform movement and have led to very healthy reviews of major concerns in athletics. May I introduce to you now for his state of the Association address, our Executive Director, Dick Schultz. (Applause)

Richard D. Schultz: Madam President, delegates to the 1992 Convention, welcome to Anaheim and the 86th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Today I would like to discuss with you what I see as the four dominant pressures facing intercollegiate athletics today and in the next few years. My hope is that this discussion will help us focus on the challenges, and unite and energize us as we make decisions that will have great impact on the future of intercollegiate athletics and higher

education. The four pressures, in my judgment, are perceptions, political, financial and reform. Let's start with the perceptive pressures. Three years ago at this Convention, I mentioned to the delegates that I still felt that the majority of things happening in intercollegiate athletics today were positive. But regardless of that, you are what you are perceived to be, and we are perceived by the general public and even our faculties and staffs as not doing a good job of controlling our programs. Three years later, many people still think that all athletes are special admits, don't graduate and use steroids; that all coaches cheat and are overpaid; that faculty representatives are co-oped by their athletics departments; that governing boards and alumni-not chief executive officers—run athletics departments; that the NCAA promulgates and enforces "Mickey Mouse" eligibility rules, does not provide due process, and serves as prosecutor, judge and jury in all infractions cases. We all know that these perceptions are not accurate. Even after two Conventions of dramatic reform and a demonstrated willingness to change, many people still view us as an organization that cannot effectively deal with its own problems and is unwilling to make the major changes that are necessary to bring about true reform in intercollegiate athletics. Three years ago when I talked about the perceptions of intercollegiate athletics, I also suggested that the only way we could change these perceptions was to change the model, and I outlined a number of ways I thought we could change that model. I have been very pleased to find most of those suggestions on the Convention agenda and strongly supported by the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. I also have been very pleased that most of those proposals have passed and are now in the process of being implemented

In spite of these actions, negative perceptions still exist and have led to the second set of pressures that we are facing, which are the political pressures at both the national and state level. As you know, in our elective democracy, legislators and policymakers keenly monitor the concerns of their constituents. Although legislators have their own resources for gathering information, often reality is however their constituents perceive reality. As long as the public perceives problems and corruption in college athletics or problems with the NCAA, their representatives on all levels will feel compelled to act, regardless of whether their actions are necessary or warranted. Everyone should be aware by now that the comments made a year ago about Congressional intervention was not idle rhetoric. We find a myriad of bills that have been introduced at the Federal level during this past year—the most visible one being an omnibus "reform" bill submitted by Congressman McMillen of Maryland. This particular bill would take from the membership the ability to negotiate and control your own in-season television and radio contracts; it would dictate a new revenue distribution plan, partially based on the deemphasis of major sports and achievement of Congressionally determined social goals; it would purport to reverse the recent Supreme Court decision in the Tarkanian

Opening Business Session

case and denominate the NCAA a "state actor" for due process purposes, and it would Federally mandate the administrative structure of the NCAA. In addition, it would require the annual reporting to the secretary of education of all revenue and expenditures on a sport-bysport basis for intercollegiate athletics. During this past year, a number of hearings were held in the Congress on these issues and other facets of intercollegiate athletics, and more are scheduled when Congress reconvenes later this month.

Even though there is this plethora of Federal legislation pending, the most troublesome political action that we see taking place is happening in our states. Four states have currently passed legislation that would not only make inoperative many of our current enforcement procedures, but also would make it virtually impossible to enforce any type of rule or NCAA legislation without the potential of court action. In addition to the four bills already passed, comparable legislation is pending in at least six other states. We feel strongly that this type of state action violates the United States Constitution, as an unwarranted interference with interstate commerce, and we are hoping to prove that point in Federal court in Nevada. These political pressures are not without cost and impact, even though much of the legislation is still pending. These political pressures and the litigation that goes along with them, plus the numerous hearings that have to be staffed in the various states and in the Congress, will cost the Association over \$2.5 million in this fiscal year, not including the time and travel expenses of staff members as well as members of the Association who are required and volunteer to participate at those meetings. A very significant item occupying our attention this past year in Washington is a proposal now included in the Higher Education Reauthorization Bill, as favorably reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor, which would require NCAA member institutions awarding athletically related financial aid to make public on an individual-sport basis the audited revenues and expenditures relating to your intercollegiate athletics programs. Through our representatives in Washington, we have vigorously opposed this proposal in your behalf and were heartened last summer by the fact that Lamar Alexander, secretary of education and former member of the Knight Commission, advised the Congress of his department's formal recommendation that the proposal not be adopted. Unfortunately, the House education committee did not accept this advice, and in all likelihood, the fate of this proposal will be decided in the House-Senate conference some time this spring. On this particular issue, the question has been raised in the Congress concerning the vigor of your opposition to this House proposal.

For that reason, the Council has determined to place before the general session a resolution of opposition on which each Division I and II member can record its view. A roll-call vote will be requested so as to permit us to bring to the attention of each senator and representative the position taken by the institution(s) he or she represents. When the future course of this legislation becomes more clear, I will be writing to

each of you to ask you to express your views on the subject to the members of Congress. We would like to view a vote in favor of the resolution also as a commitment by you to provide this critical support for our efforts in Washington. It not only is time-consuming and demanding to deal with these various political pressures, but it is very important that we have the support of the membership in dealing with these issues. We have found from experience that the support from the membership—by making key telephone calls and writing appropriate letters at various times—is very effective in deterring inappropriate action on the part of our elected representatives.

Your efforts at the state level also are going to be important. Some schools in states where the so-called "due process" laws have been passed have found out that the bill has greater impact than intended, even on the operation of their own athletics departments. In fact, in some cases, they are finding that they no longer can maintain institutional control of their programs because the same law intended to be used against the NCAA also can be used against them individually. To preserve your right as a voluntary Association to make rules and to enforce those rules, it is very important that we have the support of each institution-from the governing board to the chief executive officer to the athletics director to the coaches to everyone concerned not just in lip service to us, but in active support of NCAA activities regarding these laws with your own lobbying efforts at the state or

If you are not satisfied with the enforcement and infractions process as it exists today, you have the ability to change it through the Association's legislative process. This will be far more effective than remaining silent and allowing your state to enact legislation, which in the long run could impact your ability to control your own programs. We hope that in the future we will get strong support to requests for telephone calls, letters and personal contact with elected officials to help support these initiatives on your behalf.

Perhaps the most crucial current pressure is the financial pressure. I have been involved in athletics for over 40 years and I think the financial pressure on higher education is the most challenging that I have witnessed. As you well know, I travel this nation from coast to coast and am on many college campuses each year. Those of you who are the most fortunate are the ones who have received budget freezes. Most of you have received substantial cuts in your budgets, have faculty positions that you cannot fill and are looking for various ways to work within the financial constraints that have been placed upon you. Financial studies indicate that almost 70 percent of the Division I schools will not generate enough revenue this year to pay the actual expenses of their athletics departments. When this type of pressure exists, everybody has to roll up his or her sleeves and do whatever possible to reduce expenses and maximize revenue. In an effort to develop and generate as much net revenue as possible, and to set an appropriate example, the Association budget was cut by more than \$3

million, a freeze was placed on any staff additions and in fact, we are looking at some restructuring options that would reduce the number of staff people employed by the Association. At the current time, if a staff member leaves the Association for another job, there is no automatic refilling of that position. The position has to be evaluated and deemed to be essential before approval is given to rehire. Of course, to a great degree, Association expenses are determined by what actions you take at our annual Convention that might have staff or cost implications.

In response to the financial pressures, the Executive Committee has developed a three-year planning cycle for all committees, including sports committees, so that anything that involves added expense or expansion can be well-planned and well-thought out before being approved. During this last fiscal year, this Association returned over \$90 million in direct payments to the membership and it is anticipated that distribution will exceed \$100 million in the 1991-92 fiscal year. However, that still will not be enough to meet the financial pressures that are currently in place. Last January, this Convention took action to initiate some modest cost-cutting actions that would have an impact, but not disadvantage any program. Those cuts involved scholarship reductions, reductions in coaching staffs, off-campus recruiting and the phasing out of full-scale training tables and athletics dormitories. Those cuts have created many unhappy people in the athletics world. But we have to realize that with these types of financial pressures, athletics departments are not sacrosanct when it comes to the budgetcutting process. In fact, the actions taken last January merely

It needs to be the responsibility of each and every institution to completely evaluate its athletics expenditures and continue to reduce and bring them into line, so that our programs can remain solid. It would be my hope that the elimination of sports programs would be the last method of cost reduction. We should take a look at the way we travel, the way we equip our teams and the number of administrative people that we employ. There are still many options available for cost reduction in most of our programs. It appears that one of the major sources of revenue that athletics has enjoyed the past 10 years—the revenue from television-will be going down rather than up in the years ahead. Because of that, it is important that we start to plan for that downturn immediately. Too many times in athletics our response to tight budgets has been to try to generate more revenue. We need to continue to do that, but we also must develop good cost-control measures if we are going to survive and maintain the quality that we would like to see in our programs. Our future success and opportunities will depend on our resourcefulness, creativity and our ability to plan for

The first three pressures that we have discussed—the perceptive pressures, political pressures and financial pressures—have led to the fourth pressure—the pressure for reform. We talked last year about the fact that it is natural to fear change because we are not sure what 68 ______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

that change will actually mean. The past three years have seen some very remarkable change in the conduct and the direction of intercollegiate athletics. Much of this is due to the strong leadership of the NCAA Presidents Commission. Their work has gained them the support of their peers and today we see more chief executive officers directly involved in athletics affairs than ever before. While some resent the presidential involvement as an intrusion into a hallowed area, intercollegiate athletics as we know it today will not survive this decade if presidents are not directly involved and in control. This year, other than developing legislative proposals, the Presidents Commission established a rolling three-year strategic plan so the membership, the media and the public will know in advance what the Commission's major areas of emphasis will be. This will provide the membership with more opportunities to comment on potential proposals and give feedback to the Commission well in advance of the development of legislation. I also want to take this opportunity to compliment the Commission on being open to all constituent groups and for listening to them and seeking their opinions. The Commission has pledged even a greater emphasis on meeting with constituent groups in the future, bringing them together as a part of its regular agenda, rather than including them in after-dinner meetings. In my mind, this will provide all interested groups an opportunity to be heard and to debate their points. I think it is important to point out, however, that listening to the opinions of others does not necessarily mean agreeing with them, but at least there will be an expanded opportunity for all interested groups to present their positions to the Commission this year and in the years

We will not successfully deal with these pressures by crawling into a shell, by becoming divisive or trying to promote our own individual agendas. But we can deal with and remove these pressures with a commitment to positive change in the spirit of openness, trust and cooperation. While we have come a long way, we have a long way to go. In my mind, there still are a number of things that have to happen for us to remove these pressures and to keep pace in an ever-changing world. First, we need to strongly support the academic proposals submitted by the Presidents Commission and supported by the Council. While we can argue about accessibility and research, the fact is that these are still modest requirements when compared to the average requirements for a college student. We also need your continued support in putting together an acceptable certification program for athletics departments that will be effective in 1993. We need to continue to be open to new ideas and change that will enable us to better meet the needs of intercollegiate athletics in the 1990s. As you may recall, I announced last year that we were having a meeting in Kansas City for representatives of Division I sports. We had over 50 Division I coaches representing all sports in a two-day session. We broke them into five groups: football, men's basketball, women's basketball, team sports and individual sports. They had identical Opening Business Session

agendas and we had two of our staff people with each group.

The whole purpose of this meeting was to see if we could come up with some common agreement to simplify and reduce recruiting rules so that these suggestions could be passed along to the appropriate committees and the NCAA Council for potential legislation. After two days, we saw something very interesting: football and men's and women's basketball coaches did not want any change in the rules; in fact, they advocated tougher enforcement penalties. The team- and individual-sport coaches were prepared to eliminate and deregulate many rules. The point of all this is that the vast majority of our rules are made for football and basketball, and then we let them fall out and impact on the other sports. I think it is time for us to begin a study as to the potential value of federating our rules on a sport-by-sport basis or at least by categories similar to those used in our Kansas City meetings. While I acknowledge it would take some time to do this, I think we may find that it would be far more satisfactory, less frustrating and actually cost-effective to adjust our rules in this way.

If we are going to deal with the political pressures that we are receiving from the states, it is going to be very important that we adopt most of the measures that were recommended by the special committee that reviewed the enforcement process. This was a dynamic committee made up of some of the top legal minds in America, as well as people from the membership who have gone through the enforcement process. While some may need to be modified for the comfort of and the maintenance of the process by the membership, it is important that the majority of these items are put in place, so we can demonstrate that we are willing to take a look at ourselves, make the necessary changes and not have these changes forced on us from the outside. We are not talking about change for the sake of change, or a public relations gesture; we are talking about an effort to save and protect the enforcement and infractions process.

Personally, I am still concerned about the lack of flexibility in dealing with many common-sense issues, especially situations involving the eligibility of our student-athletes. We have to remember that those athletes only go around one time, and when they lose a year of eligibility, that is a year out of their life in a very limited time period. It troubles me to see many athletes suffering and losing eligibility based on an innocent act or misunderstanding of the rules or in some cases, a mistake made by others. You have an opportunity to take the first step toward granting more flexibility in the administration of our rules through Proposal No. 117, a resolution that would provide the Council with more waiver authority after legislation is submitted in 1993. I would strongly urge that you support this measure so that we can investigate ways of more fairly and evenly administering the rules that are passed in Convention.

Finally, we need to be constantly aware of providing more opportunities for minorities in our coaching and administrative positions and of guaranteeing gender equity in all that we do. Let's not wait for a stepped-up Federal enforcement program to force these issues, but rather, let's be dynamic, let's take a leadership role in addressing and solving these problems. We have the ability to do it. All we have to do is have the will to do it. Today I have discussed with you what I see as the very real pressures that challenge intercollegiate athletics. During my travels this past year, I have been impressed with your strong belief in our system and encouraged by the leadership and commitment you continue to devote to addressing these challenges.

And—as unlikely as it may seem—I have also been impressed by many of our critics. We all share a common goal: to provide the highest quality possible for our student-athletes and our institutions. The difference is, we—the membership of the NCAA—have the knowledge and expertise to most effectively realize this goal. Now, it is incumbent on us in our responsibility this week and throughout the year, to respond to our challenges, to change when necessary, and to actively demonstrate our commitment to a system of which we all can be proud. Good luck and may God bless you. (Applause)

President Sweet: Thank you very much, Dick. This concludes the opening business session of the 1992 Convention. This meeting is now duly recessed.

[The opening business session was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.]

ings Opening Business Session



Wednesday Morning, January 8, 1992

The Division I-A business session was called to order at 8 a.m. by Division I Vice-President Douglas S. Hobbs, University of California, Los Angeles.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Hobbs: The Division I-A business session is hereby convened. Before we get to our legislative business, I would like to make several announcements. First, allow me to call your attention to two of your Convention publications. First, on page six in the blue program you will find the program for this Division I-A business session.

Then in your Official Notice, please see Appendix J, Page 242. That will list the 17 proposals that we will take action on this morning. Our first order of business will be to vote on the 17 items, which I believe are now 16 as a result of a withdrawal. Then we will entertain any discussion of the proposals on the agenda for the Division I business session, which will convene at 10 o'clock.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Coaching Limitations-Division I-A

Charles M. Neinas (College Football Association): I move Proposal No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

Jack Lengyel (U.S. Naval Academy): Proposal No. 51 is an issue that coaches have discussed extensively and feel that this particular arrangement of coaches gives a better representation of the coaching staff. They think that the four unrestricted coaches leaves a lot of latitude for potential violations. They also feel that providing for the graduate assistants provides an upward mobility for student-athletes to move into the coaching profession. I believe there are a couple of issues that will be coming back next year if this amendment passes that will clarify the retention of the graduate assistants and avoid having them move from institution to institution by allowing them to complete their graduate degree in the year period and have a satisfactoryprogress rule within that structure of a minimum of 12 hours per semester or they cannot continue as a graduate assistant. This is also, we believe, a little more cost effective than the other proposal. Thank you.

William T. Turner (North Carolina State University): As an institution that has had cause in recent years to examine its own institutional control, we find Proposal No. 51 to be a very important

72 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

piece of legislation that we think can have a very important impact on college football. There are three things that this proposal does that support the reform movement. First of all, as Jack mentioned, it is certainly a proposal that will legitimize the graduate assistant. Secondly, the issue of institutional control is easier to address with fulltime staff members rather than restricted-earnings or part-time coaches. We believe this is an extremely important part of this issue. Thirdly, cost savings. We did an extensive study at North Carolina State and determined that the 1-9-2 (coaching limitation) would save us between \$11,500 to \$18,500 in the first year over the 1-8-4. So, for those reasons, we are very much in support of Proposal No. 51 and urge the membership to support it also.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I rise in support of Proposal No. 51. The head football coaches of Division I-A schools, I think about 50 of us, met in Dallas in June to discuss some of the items in the sense of how it affected our programs. In trying to be sensitive to the cost-containment reform movement, we looked to exactly what was mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina State as to how much money we would save with 1-8-4 as opposed to 1-9-2. At that time, we did a survey of the coaches who were there. We did not have all Division I-A head football coaches; it may have been as many as 65 to 70. The average salary of the ninth coach, the gentleman that you probably will have to let go if we were forced into the 1-8-4, was \$35,700. The average cost of a GA (graduate assistant) was \$9,200. With the figures and everything else, we came up with the same figures that the people from North Carolina State did—that a 1-9-2 would save us money. That was the first consideration because we felt if we were going to address this Convention in the sense of trying to get that legislation changed, we had to be consistent with what the presidents wanted in the cost-containment area. I think we can justify that.

The second thing I think is more important, even though we could not justify the cost-containment provision of it. We have gone through the restricted-earnings coaches, a fancy name for a part-time coach, with tremendous abuses. We had those abuses, and we, as coaches, mainly through the efforts of the CFA, worked to eliminate the part-time coach to come up with the GA. The GA situation, as it is now, is not one that I am comfortable with. I would hope that we would come back next year and refine the GA. The GA situation we discussed in Dallas in June at the American Football Coaches Association meeting went somewhat like this, and unfortunately it was not presented to this Convention in the form that we had thought it would be. That was, in order to be a GA, you had to be a bona fide graduate student in a bona fide program supervised by the dean of the graduate school and all the other things that our legitimate graduate student goes through; and at the end of one year, he had to pass all 12 credits. If he did not pass the 12 credits, he cannot continue with you. He has to pass 24 credits at the end of the second year in order to continue in his program, and he had the third year, wherein he could take the additional 12 credits, which probably

Division I-A Business Session

would lead to his master's degree.

In the present structure, the two years that we eliminate a graduate assistant is not reasonable. It cannot be done. We are trying to bring people into our profession and teach them how to coach and evaluate whether they have the potential of being the kind of people we want in college coaches. To give them the duties they need to think they can get a master's degree in two years is unrealistic. I have some reservations about this proposal, but only in the sense that we need to refine exactly what a graduate assistant is. But under any circumstances, and I hope that the people will understand, I am not here with any ax to grind. A 1-8-4 situation for me, personally, and for Penn State, my institution, would work better for us than a 1-9-2 as far as being able to coach. We have extra people and I have letters on my desk now from coaches who are 53 and 54 years of age that want to get out of high school and want to be restricted-earnings coaches because the kids are all grown up and they want to get in there. If I could get their wives a halfway decent job they are all set to come. I can get their wives a halfway decent job. I don't really want to get into that. I want to give us a chance to develop young people. I have a boy of my own who is a GA in Virginia doing graduate work in political science. He wants to know if he wants to coach, and he will be evaluated whether he has the ability to coach. I think that is the proper way for us to develop entry-level people. If we don't do that, if we eliminate the GA and go to a restricted-earnings coach, we have taken a gigantic step backwards. We had 18 at one time, we had part-time coaches, and the part-time coach was making \$80,000 as the offensive coordinator. That is not a horror story, it is an actual story.

I think we can do better than the restricted-earnings coaches. I think we can do better than this proposal as far as the 1-9-2 as we define GAs. I hope that in the spirit of fine-tuning the legislation, that we would be able to get the support from this group to go with 1-9-2 and give us an opportunity to come back with a proposal that will give us a graduate-assistant program wherein we can literally train young people to be the kind of coaches that I think that the presidents of our institutions want us to train—young people who are bright, who have a sensitivity to an academic situation because of their graduate experience, and also have the opportunity to gain experience with some high-level coaching for an opportunity to be successful in our profession. I very strongly, and I speak on behalf of almost all of our Division I-A football coaches, urge you to support Proposal 51.

R. Gerald Turner (University of Mississippi): I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 51. The Presidents Commission has a list of those proposals regarding the changes that were implemented in January, and we do have concern about this one. We officially are on record to oppose. The principle that was gained this past year is the necessity of a reduction in expenditures. That reduction can be both in terms of money, initially, or in terms of personnel and the money reflected more fully later. The most important part of the change last

January was the reduction from head coach and nine full-time assistants to a head coach and eight full-time assistants. If there is to be fine-tuning, it would be the Presidents Commission's desire that we maintain the 1-8 to where there is a real reduction in full-time coaching and that any revision come in the restricted-earnings category, the four that are listed there, rather than going to the 1-9-2 and then dealing with the two. We feel it is very important to maintain the one head coach and eight full-time assistants and we officially have opposed Proposal No. 51.

James D. McComas (Virginia Polytechnic Institute): I would like to join in speaking against this particular motion. It seems to me that this is just another way of adding a full-time coach. Let the group do the refinement, come back at the next Convention, and then let us consider it. I urge us to vote against this motion.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I would just hope that in the spirit of refinement that was stated last year when the presidents came to this Convention and said "let's pass it," even though many of us at that time had very, very strong reservations as to some of the legislation that was being passed in the preservations as to some

of the legislation that was being passed in the name of reform and cost containment, to suggest that we have to eliminate a coach, to go from one to eight and add four restricted-earnings coaches, which will cost us more than a 1-9-2, doesn't really seem to me to be consistent with what we had agreed upon. We felt that we would step back, rethink the things, and then come back to this Convention. Now, I don't know why we have to say that you have to cut out a coach if cutting out the coach and adding the restricted-earnings coach does not save us money. I have a very difficult time with that. I have a very difficult time cutting out a mature coach when you people, the presidents, are asking us to graduate kids, keep them out of trouble and do a lot things that take an awful lot of time. I thought that the proposal to only put seven people on the road to recruit basically was a good one because it kept two coaches at home who were able to spend more time with the people on your campus. But to say that you are to cut a coach, which does nothing in the way of saving money, does nothing that will help our program, does not allow us to do a better job and opens up the abuses of a restrictedearnings coach, seems that maybe the presidents are not giving the coaches enough trust.

We know what we are doing. I feel strongly about that. As I said, with 42 years of coaching in college, I would hope that the presidents would understand. I am not up here to badger anybody or anything like that. I have to speak on what is in the best interest of football. That is what I am interested in, what is best for football. The game has been very good to me and to most of our institutions. To say we have to eliminate a coach for no apparent reason seems to me that maybe we have taken a stand on this thing that we are just not going to give in on anything.

Jack Lengyel (U.S. Naval Academy): With all respect to the Presidents Commission, we certainly understand your concern for reform. We feel very strongly and support what Joe was just talking

about. We have been through this drill before with restricted-earnings coaches under a different label. The opportunity for abuses that we are opening up in this process is not worth what we are trying to do with the 1-9-2. We think the 1-9-2 is not only cost effective, it eliminates potential for abuses in the future with regard to the four unrestricted coaches. Based on cost effectiveness and on the fact that it hopefully prevents future problems with staffs, which we have already been through, we would again urge the membership to support this resolu-

Vincent J. Dooley (University of Georgia): I just want to reemphasize that we are going backwards. We had part-time coaches in football and during that period there was a wholesale circumventing of the rules or outright violations that were never looked into. We finally got that corrected, and now we are going back to what was one of the biggest problems that we had in college football—the part-time coach. So I want to again reemphasize what has been said is a problem with the legislation that was passed last year, and that is the restrictedearnings coach is a part-time coach. We already have seen coaches trying to figure out ways to get around the rule as was done several years ago before we eliminated the part-time coach.

[Proposal No. 51 (Page A-83) was approved by Division I-A.]

Mr. Hobbs: Proposal No. 52 is moot. Before we move on, allow me to make an announcement that I should have made earlier. The following proposals have been withdrawn: Proposal No. 17, which we were to discuss in the Division I meeting; Proposal No. 40; Proposal No. 65, which was on our agenda in the I-A meeting; Proposal No. 80; Proposal No. 105; Proposal No. 110; Proposal No. 148; Proposal No. 65 has been withdrawn, so we are now on Proposal No. 66.

Maximum Initial Grants-in-Aid-Partial Qualifiers and Nonqualifiers

Thomas L. Jones (University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Hobbs: This is Part A only.

Mr. Jones: This proposal would gradually reduce the number of grants-in-aid that may be awarded after the first academic year to student-athletes who initially enroll at the certifying institution as partial qualifiers or nonqualifiers so that no grants-in-aid may be awarded to such students beginning with the 1996-97 academic year. It is our belief that this proposal will further strengthen the academic standards by limiting the number of grants-in-aid that may be awarded to student-athletes who initially enroll as partial qualifiers or nonqualifiers. I think that perhaps with the adoption of this proposal, coaches will be less inclined to recruit student-athletes whose academic potentials are suspect or marginal.

Mr. Hobbs: May I call your attention to the fact that this proposal has been subject to Interpretation No. 11, which was distributed this morning.

1992 Convention Proceedings

[Proposal No. 66-A (Page A-95) was defeated by Division I-A.]

Spring Football Practice—Divisions I-A and I-AA

David M. Guinn (Baylor University): Mr. Chair, we move adoption of No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

Robert W. Lawless (Texas Tech University): I move Amendment 83-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a very simple amendment. It just extends the number of days for which spring practice can be held from 22 to 29. It retains the maximum number of contact days, 10, and the prohibition on Sunday practices. We believe this is a good amendment. It removes the time compression and is principally better for the student-athletes by allowing more time to not be compressed in terms of studies aspects and also more time for healing. It also gives the coaches some flexibility about rescheduling around inclement weather.

Richard R. Eakin (East Carolina University): I wish to speak in support of Proposal No. 83-1. This proposal retains the limit of 10 contact sessions and extends by one week the days available to schedule a total of 15 practice sessions. Clearly, the proposal will provide flexibility in scheduling practices around the inclement weather that many universities will suffer. It also will allow us to schedule around required university activities. The most important aspect, however, of this proposal is the advantage it provides the players. The current legislation requires teams to complete 15 practice sessions in just 22

G. James Francis (Colorado State University): I would like to support Amendment 83-1. As President Lawless has pointed out, there is no basic change in the number of days of practice or the number of days of contact. From an educator's standpoint, we feel that it is beneficial to the student-athlete and that it does take some of the time compression away that previously existed and allows that student more study time in the spring. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 83 (Page A-112) was approved by Division I-A as amended by No. 83-1.]

Recruiting—Division I-A Head Football Coach

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 130.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 130 would permit a Division I-A head football coach to make all campus recruiting contacts with a prospect on only one calendar day. The adoption of this legislation would return the previous rule, which has worked well and should be reinstated. The current rule permits a head coach to visit a prospect on two separate days and virtually requires all Division I-A head coaches to make two of the three permissible off-campus recruiting contacts with the prospect. This proposal is supported by both the Subcommittee to Review 1991 Reform Proposals and the Council. I urge you to adopt Proposal No.

Division I-A Business Session

130. Thank you.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I rise in support of this proposal. I would urge you, if you want to save money, to pass this proposal. If you want to save wear and tear on old broken down football coaches, I would urge you to pass this proposal. When we had the old rule, it was very easy. I had one appearance I had to make to see a prospect. Now, if I go once and somebody else goes twice, the youngster feels that I should go back. In these days when you are traveling by plane and private planes, that gets very, very expensive. I know that the Presidents Commission had good intentions and that this was going to save money. Actually, the rule we have right now where the coach would go back is very expensive. The head coach probably spends more money than the combined expenses of the whole staff. I would urge that we go back to the old rule. Keep him off the road. Let him have some dignity and don't make him go back in there time and time again and ask the kid how his girlfriend is doing, what is new in the neighborhood and all of that other nonsense. One appearance by the head coach would have to be done. I have a saying at Penn State that if I see him once I get him, and if two times, he slips away. In the old days, I saw him three times and it was over. He was going some place else. One is plenty for me.

[Proposal No. 130 (Page A-157) was approved by Division I-A.]

Permissible Contacts

Vincent J. Dooley (University of Georgia): I move the adoption of Amendment No. 131-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

Throughout the 35 years I have coached football at the college level, there was no single recruiting issue that was more of a problem to the coaches than the contact rules. I say "rules" because there were several different pieces of legislation enacted during that period of time that dealt with the contact rule, most all of which had no real input from the coaches. All of the legislation that was enacted, though well intended, never adequately addressed the problem. Each rule provided opportunities for innovative coaches to either circumvent the spirit of the rule, rationalize a violation on a technicality or outright violate the rules because of the difficulty of the enforcement. The most famous and popular means of circumventing the contact rule was the so-called "bump." Bumping student-athletes became so widespread that the degrees of this technique were put in categories of mild to heavy. The extent was to be determined, as one coach put it, by the bruises left on the student-athlete. At each Convention, a new contact rule was enacted to close the gap and the loophole found by the coaches. There was no single issue that I can recall that caused more mistrust among the coaching profession. The violations of these rules were so numerous that an NCAA enforcement officer investigating any case could always be assured of a contact violation regardless of the other potential NCAA violations. Approximately five years ago, the football coaches at an annual association meeting hammered out a contact rule that eventually

1992 Convention Proceedings

was enacted into legislation that ended up being the best recruiting rule we ever had. The rule was simple, understandable and enforceable.

During the five years that the rule was in effect, there were practically no violations and the result was a spirit of trust among the coaches, which sometimes is hard to do in such a competitive atmosphere. Last year the rule was arbitrarily changed without any significant input by the coaches. What is happening today on the recruiting trail is a throw-back to the past. Once again, there are coaches trying to search for opportunities to circumvent the rules, which, once again, is causing mistrust among coaches. The membership is responding as it has done in the past and on previous occasions to try to close the loopholes. We will have Proposal No. 132, which addresses the innovative bogus prospect. I ask you to please realize that there are different reasons in force and to listen to the football coaches and restore once again a rule that has passed the test of time and proven to be the most effective recruiting rule ever enacted in college football.

Tom Osborne (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I would like to also speak in favor of Proposal No. 131, echoing some of the things that Vince has already mentioned. Many of us who have been in coaching for a number of years wrestled with the same problems that Vince outlined. I would simply like to emphasize again that the old contact rule of once a week, three times in the home, was universally understood and I think abided by, by more coaches than any we have ever had. I also would like to point out that most athletes, if you have them in your program for four to five years and pay their scholarship, medical costs, drug testing and academic support, will run to a \$40,000to \$60,000 to \$70,000 investment. If you have only three face-to-face contacts with that student-athlete, many times you have a very difficult time assessing his character, how he fits into your program and how your program fits him. There always have been mistakes in recruiting; but with the current three-contact rule, we are going to have more. It will not be good for the program and it will not be good for student-athletes. I also might add that we did keep tabs of our own coaches' expenses during the month of December. You would think with the three-contact rule that you would save money. We found that we used more air travel. We had fewer coaches who were going to an area getting in a car and seeing 10 or 12 prospects in a 200- to 300-mile radius, but rather criss-crossing the country. As a result, we actually spent more money in December than we had under the previous rule. We don't think that is cost effective and we certainly would urge adoption of the old rule.

Joseph V. Paterno (Pennsylvania State University): I speak in support of the proposal. I think that it might be a good idea because I think a lot of people don't quite understand what the purpose of recruiting is. Again, I feel an obligation to college football. I am winding down my career. I think we ought to put this thing in perspective. What is recruiting? Recruiting is nothing but a school looking at a young man and giving him an opportunity, and that young man looking at a

particular institution and trying to find out whether that is the best place for him. If you would put yourself in the shoes of the studentathlete who may have to decide between Michigan, Penn State, Illinois or Notre Dame, he has a tough decision to make. When I start out talking to the kid and I ask him what schools he will visit, he may put a school in there that I don't think is appropriate to what I think he wants to do in respect to his athletics ability. I eliminate that student.

If you don't pick the right schools, if you don't have a tough decision to make about which college you are going to select, then you have not selected the right schools to visit. You have not shown interest in the right schools because it ought to be a very difficult decision. As a father of a student-athlete, if I were in a position where my kid had to make a decision from the schools I mentioned, and I can pick four or five others-it doesn't make any difference whether it's on the coast like Stanford, Cal Berkeley and Southern Cal, or in the South, looking at North Carolina and Duke-that youngster has a tough decision to make. He has an extremely difficult decision to make. For this group to say that that kid only is allowed to talk one-on-one with the representative of that particular institution three times on a decision that will probably be the first manly decision that kid will make, because it will affect him the rest of his life, doesn't make sense. Now, three is too many. Whether once a week is too many in the eyes of some people, I don't know. All I know is that when we were allowed to go once a week, we had no problems. We had no mistrust. We didn't have people working around the rules.

If a kid had a bona fide situation in which somebody presented a question about our institution, like "I am not sure your engineering school would give me what I want," or "you don't have a business school? I am interested in business, and Penn State came in and told me you don't have a business school and I am interested in doing this," you will have an opportunity to sit down with that youngster and plan some things. You can't do that over the phone. It is difficult to do it in a letter. You really need a one-on-one situation with the kid. I don't have any idea whether this legislation will save any money or not in one year or if once a week is going to save money. I do know that we are not being fair. We are not being fair to the student-athlete if we tell him or her that they can only have three opportunities to discuss the most important decision in their lives. I think we owe them more opportunities for discussion because regardless of what you say, whether you can go in and stay four hours in a home or an hour and one-half in the high school, a follow-up visit has to be made. There is follow-up that has to be made so the youngster feels secure when he makes the decision. We can turn down this proposal. That is fine. That is certainly your right. But I am telling you that you are doing a disservice to the studentathlete who has a very important decision to make in the confines of three one-on-one contacts.

[Proposal No. 131-A (Page A-158) was defeated by Division I-A, 56-61, roll-call vote.]

Football—Visits to High School

Cedric W. Dempsey (University of Arizona): Mr. Chair, on behalf of all 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move Proposal No. 132. [The motion was seconded.]

Amendment No. 13.1.4 was passed in 1991 as a cost-reduction measure. Unfortunately, we have found a loophole in that legislation, which doesn't necessarily mean that it is a cost-reduction measure. As Mr. Dooley described, the possible loophole is that the coaches may identify bogus prospects at a high school and continue to make numerous visits to the high school, making contacts with several different prospects while letting the prospect they are really recruiting know they are in the high school. The proposal would eliminate this practice. As indicated, in the sport of football institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than three days during the football contact period. I urge your

[Proposal No. 132 (Page A-160) was approved by Division I-A.]

Football Evaluations

Charles F. Taylor (University of Cincinnati): On behalf of the sponsors, I would like to move Proposal No. 133. [The motion was seconded.]

が 一般の In the past few years, among other things, we have reduced the number of scholarships in football. We have increased the minimum academic requirements for student-athletes. We have reduced the number of football coaches, we have reduced the number of off-campus recruiters in the sport of football, and we have reduced spring practice opportunities in football. Last year we also severely limited the number of student-athlete evaluation opportunities by institutional staff members during the applicable contact and evaluation periods. Taken in the context of the 1991 Convention, it might have made sense. However, just like a lot of January resolutions, it doesn't necessarily stand to reason that everything in January works as we planned in October and November. If we will take a moment to listen to reason and reality, it is evident that when one considers all the reductions mandated for football over the past few years, we need more evaluations, not fewer. More evaluations will increase retention. More evaluations will enable the coaches to live more comfortably within the number of reductions in scholarships. More evaluations will enable us to greatly reduce or eliminate the run-off, a connotation that none of us want or need. Please consider this proposal out of context of our most recent Conventions. It should be considered as a reasonable proposal to strengthen football at a time when gradually adding rules, rules which are taken one at a time are okay but taken collectively are eroding the

Thomas K. Hearn Jr. (Wake Forest University): During the 1991 Convention, we enacted legislation to limit an institution to four evaluation opportunities in all sports during the academic year. This proposal is clearly contrary to that legislation and does not constitute

Division I-A	Business	Session
--------------	----------	---------

fine-tuning but running backwards. This proposal treats football differently from all other sports and will raise a climate that all other sports be treated in a similar way should this be adopted. On behalf of the Presidents Commission, which has stated its opposition to this proposal, I urge you to join in its defeat.

[Proposal No. 133 (Page A-161) was defeated by Division I-A.]

Football Evaluations

Bill Byrne (University of Oregon): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference and the Southern Conference, I move Proposal No. 134.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Byrne: I also move Proposal No. 134-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of Proposal No. 134 and No. 134-1 is to move the evaluation period to start the first of May when our coaches start spring recruiting. Unfortunately, when we put Proposal No. 134 together, we also gave them a 13-month recruiting period knowing full well there are only 12 months in the year. No. 134-1 would change that.

[Proposal No. 134-1 (Page A-162) was approved by Division I-A.] Mr. Byrne: Mr. Chair, the football coaches would need the same number of evaluations. They just want you to understand that the spring recruiting starts the evaluation period. That is the purpose of this amendment.

Proposal No. 134 (Page A-162) was approved by Division I-A as amended by No. 134-1.]

Evaluations - Division I Football

Jim Livengood (Washington State University): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move Proposal No. 135.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, the intent of Proposal No. 135 is to eliminate Fridays during the month of October as an evaluation period for Division I football. Both as a morale factor, I think as far as coaches being away from teams, as well as a financial factor, we believe that it would be in the best interest to pass this particular proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 135 (Page A-163) was defeated by Division I-A, 47-64, roll-call vote.

Evaluations—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Frank Windegger (Texas Christian University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 136.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment would allow an institution's coaching staff the use of Saturday as part of its 15 days of evaluation. It saves money and allows for evaluations on Saturdays, where there are a number of highschool athletic events scheduled. It also would reduce the number of days that a coach would be off campus and away from currently enrolled student-athletes. I ask your support of this proposal.

R. Gerald Turner (University of Mississippi): On our sheet from the Presidents Commission, we had listed opposition to this proposal and I wish to remove that opposition to Proposal No. 136.

_______1992 Convention Proceedings

[Proposal No. 136 (Page A-163) was approved by Division I-A.]

Dead Period—Division I-A Football

Larry O. Templeton (Mississippi State University): Mr. Chair, I would like to move adoption of No. 137.

[The motion was seconded.]

As an administrator, I just think it is much cleaner to have an institutional representative there on the signing date. If we are not careful with the U.S. mail service, we are going to extend more than our initial limits on these signing dates,

Donnie Duncan (University of Oklahoma): I believe that this is a cost-containment issue. It has cost thousands of dollars in recruiting and we cannot effectively manage at the end of the process. I believe that it also is fair to the student-athlete, in the sense that after direct answers from student-athlete A, it gives you a chance to plan and move to student-athlete B. A much more well-coordinated process would result. I urge its passage.

Thomas K. Hearn Jr. (Wake Forest University): The Presidents Commission has recorded its opposition to this proposal. It reestablishes the old rule, which we just changed, related to contacts with prospective student-athletes around the National Letter of Intent. Thus, this is contrary to the efforts we have been making to attempt to rationalize the recruiting process. Member institutions are now permitted unlimited telephone calls on the National Letter of Intent signing date and two days subsequent, so that institutions have ample opportunity and means to discuss with prospects the letter of intent. The Presidents Commission urges you to defeat this proposal.

Fred L. Miller (San Diego State University): The previous speakers talked about perception. Our concern is that there is a danger of oversigning of youngsters. This is an initial and overall head count sport, and we urge support of the amendment. We want to avoid potential

Paul L. Roach (University of Wyoming): We feel passage of this would eliminate an atmosphere that could be created for undesirable influence and confusion at a very critical time in the process. We also feel that not to have a representative there could very well place the high-school coach in a precarious position of having to explain or answer some of the questions about the importance of the National

[Proposal No. 137 (Page A-164) was defeated by Division I-A.] Mr. Hobbs: That concludes our legislative activity for this session. Now is the time that the members may discuss any matters of legislation that will be picked up in the Division I business session that will start at 10:15. Seeing no one at the microphones, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

[The Division I-A business session was adjourned at 9:10 a.m.]

ness Session



Division I-AA Business Session

Wednesday Morning, January 8, 1992

The Division I-AA business session, held January 8, 1992, was called to order at 8:10 a.m., with Joseph N. Crowley, University of Nevada, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Crowley: Ladies and gentlemen, it is time to be under way. Our parliamentarian this morning is Frank Bonner of Furman University. I have some announcements before we get under way. If I may call your attention to a couple of Convention publications. In the Convention Program on page 6, you will find the agenda for the Division I-AA business session. In your Official Notice in Appendix J, there is a listing of 17 proposals that we are scheduled to take action on this morning. We will vote on those proposals, and then if time permits, we will entertain any discussion that you may wish to pursue with respect to other proposals on the Division I business session agenda.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Restricted-Earnings Coaches—Varsity/Junior Varsity Program

Mr. Crowley: We now will begin the business session, taking in order the items on our agenda beginning with Proposal No. 53.

Frederick H. Dunlap (Colgate University): I move Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a proposal that was in the 1987 Manual to add two part-time or graduate-assistant coaches for schools that conduct a junior varsity football program in Division I-AA and play a schedule of four or more games. When we moved to the restricted-earnings coaches, schools that have JV programs neglected to put this on the agenda last year as a proposal. We're trying to bring back two additional restrictive coaches to run and coach a JV program.

[Proposal No. 53 (Page A-83) was approved by Division I-AA.]

Restricted-Earnings Coaches—Division I-AA

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I move Proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

This measure is well within the spirit of cost containment that we voted upon last year. No additional funds would be required under this proposal. I think we always need to be concerned about having new coaches coming into the ranks and having people get introduced to what coaching is all about. This proposal will provide more opportunities

______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

at those institutions that choose to use this option.

This will also give those schools that compete against Division I-A schools an advantage in that we would have more people to assist us in keeping our teams prepared and well coached.

David B. Wagner (Georgia Southern University): You all recall last year how we got into the position we are now in with the reform issues. This was an issue that got swept up with the reform. The issue was directed at Division I-A institutions that were violating the spirit of the part-time coach provisions. It was not a part-time coach position; he was a coach getting a full-time salary with a part-time title. We were not the ones that were in violation of that.

This issue was passed at the last Convention. The effect of it was that we get two coaches where we had five before. There are no savings at our particular institution and a lot of other institutions. We need to continue to be a training ground for young coaches. We don't need two part-time coaches. We need more coaches for our players, and this makes sense. I urge your support of this issue. I believe it provides enough flexibility within our institutions to continue with the type of staffs that we have had and not increase our costs.

Sheldon Hackney (University of Pennsylvania): I am speaking on behalf of the Presidents Commission to urge you to vote no on this proposal. It obviously has some attractions, but the Presidents Commission thinks that having numerous part-time restricted coaches will only increase the pressures on institutions to provide other support for them. Although it looks as if it is cost-free, it will not be cost-free in reality. So we urge you to vote no.

[Proposal No. 54 (Page A-84) was defeated by Division I-AA, 38-55,

Restricted-Earnings Coach—Division I-AA

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): On behalf of the Southern Conference, I move Proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation allows Division I-AA to enjoy the same flexibility with the restricted-earnings coaches that Division I-A currently enjoys. We think that this brings our programs into a position where they can continue to be competitive. We urge your support for this legislation.

[Proposal No. 55 (Page A-85) was defeated by Division I-AA, 40-

Heritage Bowl

Charles S. Boone (University of Richmond): On behalf of the Executive Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 86.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Boone: I move No. 86-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Many of you may recall at the 1991 Convention that the membership approved legislation that permitted the champions of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and the Southwestern Athletic Conference to participate in the Heritage Bowl. When it was presented on the

Division I-AA Business Session ___

Convention floor, the proposal specified that the game would not conflict with the Division I-AA championship. This year, the game was played December 21, the same day as the Division I-AA football championship. So the intent of the original Proposal No. 86 specified that in the future that this game would not be played any earlier than the week after the championship game for Division I-AA.

Proposal No. 86-1 states that this game can be played on the Monday after the Division I-AA championship. The Executive Committee feels that this would not conflict with the championship game. We believe this is good legislation and support the notion that the two conferences have indicated that in the future their conference champions would be available for selection to the Division I-AA championship. They also agreed that the two conference members that participate in the Division I-AA football championship may not participate in the Heritage Bowl the same year.

William W. Sutton (Mississippi Valley State University): Speaking on behalf of the Southwestern Athletic Conference and the MEAC, I would urge your support of this amendment. After playing the first bowl game we learned a lot. We are asking that you support this amendment so that the game can be played not sooner than the Monday after the I-AA championship game for several reasons. No. 1, we learned that the availability of the stadium in the south Florida area may be in jeopardy, depending upon the professional football teams' playoffs. Also, the availability of area hotel rooms and a number of other promotional concerns that we ran into this year makes us believe that the opportunity is much better to try to promote the game early the week after the I-AA playoffs. We urge your support of this amendment.

[Proposal No. 86-1 (Page A-117) was approved by Division I-AA.] [Proposal No. 86 (Page A-115) was approved by Division I-AA, as amended by No. 86-1.]

Postseason Football Games

Mr. Boone: On behalf of the Executive Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to ensure that the Heritage Bowl or any other bowl game in Division I-AA meets the reporting requirements as set forth in Bylaw 30.8. This would require the directors of athletics and the member institutions that participate in this game to submit to the Postseason Football Subcommittee a written report. And it is a waiver that the financial provisions outlined in Bylaw 31.5 would not have to be submitted. So this is a waiver on behalf of the Division I-AA membership.

[Proposal No. 87 (Page A-117) was approved by Division I-AA.]

Football Evaluations

Ronald D. Stephenson (Big Sky Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 134-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Oscar C. Page (Austin Peay State University): On behalf of the

_______1992 Convention Proceedings

Presidents Commission, I would like to express our opposition to Proposal No. 134-1 and No. 134. Proposal 134, if adopted, would establish a separate evaluation period for football. This proposal basically creates a 13-month evaluation period for high-school football players who have not signed a National Letter of Intent. Even if this amendment-to-amendment is passed, the adoption of No. 134 would result in a different time period for counting evaluations for football and all other sports. The Presidents Commission opposes this proposal.

[Proposal No. 134-1 (Page A-162) was defeated by Division I-AA.] Mr. Stephenson: On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 134

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 134 (Page A-162) was defeated.]

Evaluations-Division I-A Football

Mr. Waters: On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 135.
[The motion was seconded.]

I think this group needs to understand that oftentimes in Division I-AA football, it behooves our football coaches to have the ability to evaluate prospects on Friday during the month of October. In Division I-A football, they are going to be recruiting the top 100 to 200 prospects in the country. Everybody in America knows who those people are because they are on every recruiting list in the country. Fridays during October are really important to our schools because it allows our people to get out and find the prospect whose best athletics years are still ahead of them.

Ms. Viverito: I would like to clarify for the Chair that a vote in favor of No. 135 would eliminate Fridays from the October calendar, and the vote against No. 135 would keep Fridays in October in the voting calendar, just so we can be assured we all know what we are voting on.

Mr. Crowley: That is my understanding.

[Proposal No. 135 (Page A-163) was defeated by Division I-AA after a motion to postpone failed.]

Evaluations—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Mr. Stephenson: On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 136.

[The motion was seconded.]

Oscar C. Page (Austin Peay State University): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I would like to express opposition to Proposal No. 136. Division I football coaches are permitted to recruit off campus in the month of May for 15 consecutive weekdays, Monday through Friday. The adoption of Proposal No. 136 would include Saturday in the 15 consecutive weekdays.

Although it may be true that in certain areas of the country highschool athletics events are held on Saturdays, we think it would create an inequity among coaches and would necessitate coaches being on the road on weekends, which is unnecessary in some areas. It appears that the current rule provides ample opportunity for evaluations without adding this day. We oppose Proposal No. 136.

Division I-AA Business Session _____

David B. Wagner (Georgia Southern University): It just seems to me that this is logical. If you are on the road already for the week and there is an event on Saturday, I don't think that we are extending anything. I think we are just using rational judgment. Leave them out for another day. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 136 (Page A-163) was approved by Division I-AA, 50-42.]

Spring Football Practice—Divisions I-A and I-AA

Mr. Stephenson: On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 83-

[The motion was seconded.]

I would just simply urge the delegates to pass Proposal 83-1 so that we can keep our spring practice rules in Division I-AA consistent with those in Division I-A.

John H. Randolph (College of William and Mary): I urge support of Proposals 83-1 and 83 not just simply because Division I-A has passed it, but because I think it is good legislation. We have found on a trial run with 22 days in the springtime that frequent periods of inclement weather have caused a cancellation of practices and it has proved to be a hardship on some practice facilities. It has had the opposite effect of its original intent. By the postponement or rescheduling of practices in a shorter time period, it has created more pressures on the student-athlete. A longer practice period allows the coach to spread it out more gently and have less interference with academic priorities.

Mr. Waters: I think it is important that this body understands that although 29 days looks very large in number, understand that the number of practice opportunities stays the same. What Proposals 83 and 81 passing allows us to do is move practice sessions to the weekends or to spread it out so our kids aren't in class and not taking up class time.

[Proposal No. 83-1 (Page A-113) was approved by Division I-AA.]

Mr. Stephenson: I move Proposal No. 83 and use the same arguments that have been presented.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 83 (Page A-112) was approved by Division I-AA, as amended by No. 83-1, after a successful motion to postpone.]

Dead Period—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Mr. Stephenson: It is my understanding that the Division I-A business session has defeated Proposal No. 137. With that knowledge before us, I would move that we reconsider Proposal 137 at this meeting rather than postponing it to the Division I business session.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[Proposal No. 137 (Page A-167) was defeated by Division I-AA, after a successful motion to reconsider postponement.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Presidents Commission Grouping

Mr. Crowley: We have come to the end of the agenda pertaining to

proposals. It would be appropriate for discussion of other proposed legislation of interest to our division.

Charles Boone (University of Richmond): Mr. Chair, could I get a straw vote on Proposal No. 34?

[NOTE: In a straw vote, the Division I-AA members voted in opposition to Proposal No. 34.]

Financial Aid

Ronald D. Stephenson (Big Sky Conference): I have questions about Proposal Nos. 71, 72, and 73, and I think many people do as well. I don't know that I have deciphered those correctly, but I think that I have. Let me go over it as I see it. If somebody can correct me, please tell me that I am wrong so I will know what to do.

≥ I asked Linda Bruno yesterday from the Big East Conference if she could explain Proposal No. 71, and even though they were the sponsoring body, she could not. So you can understand my confusion. But it is my understanding that the intent of Proposal No. 71 is to make sure that the definition that we use to compute financial aid equivalencies is identical to the definition that we use to meet the minimum financial-aid requirements needed to meet the Division I membership criteria as specified in Bylaw 20. It is my understanding that Proposal No. 72 would limit that or would use only athletics-department aid to meet those two requirements, and that Proposals 72-1 and 73 are nearly identical, if not identical, in that once a student becomes a counter under Bylaw 15, that for purposes of meeting the membership requirements of Bylaw 20 you would include all unearned, nonrepayable countable financial aid administered and awarded by the institution, including aid not based on athletics ability. If anybody else feels or thinks otherwise, I would really appreciate hearing from you either here or privately later, because I think that is really an important clarification that we need to have made before we actually vote on those proposals. Thank you.

Frederick H. Dunlap (Colgate University): I am opposed to Proposal No. 71 because the intent does not tell everything that is in there. If you look at the heavy print, it says athletics financial aid is aid awarded by an institution's department of athletics. I am sure there are several institutions in this room whose athletics departments do not award financial aid. It is awarded through the financial aid office and it is still awarded in many cases on an individual's athletics ability. That is the reason the aid is directed there, but it is all done through financial aid.

So the wording there would eliminate some schools' complete programs from being countable aid where the legislation that makes us abide by the numbers count in certain sports includes aid that comes from the financial aid office as athletically related countable aid. So this legislation looks bad, and I hope it is defeated.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): Fred, my understanding of Proposal No. 71-1 is that it cures those problems. I want to ask whether you agree with that interpretation, and if so,

Division I-AA Business Session	
--------------------------------	--

whether you would support Proposal No. 71 if No. 71-1 passes?

Mr. Dunlap: Yes, Jeff, I would. Mr. Orleans: Thank you.

Personnel

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): I may have allowed myself to be misinterpreted to my colleagues in the Collegiate Commissioners Association. I think this body needs to make sure that we know what we have done with the passage of Proposal No. 53 and the failure of No. 54. If the people who were voting on the dissenting side wanted to reconsider, the Southern Conference would certainly support that. By passing No. 53, you have two additional coaches in addition to the two restricted-earnings coaches who were passed in last year's legislation. You now are going to have the additional expense of a junior varsity program.

If No. 54 had passed, you could have taken the two restricted-earnings coaches who were passed in last year's legislation and divided them and still had your junior varsity program without the additional cost of them. I think there is merit to both proposals. It is possible that I was not clear in our Collegiate Commissioners Association meetings. We certainly respect what Proposal 53 intended. I think there is some merit in what No. 54 would allow us to do without the additional cost of two per junior varsity program. Thank you.

Financial Aid

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I want to go back to Proposal No. 71. Something that my friend and colleague, Jeff Orleans, mentioned relative to No. 71-1 jerked my attention. As I recall, last year we passed legislation calling for the definition of new financial thresholds below which an institution could not go and still man a Division I-AA program. And one of the ingredients that was contained as a part of the attempt on the part of an institution to meet those thresholds was institution-specific aid.

As I interpret it, I would imagine that if No. 71 passes, that this then will abrogate the intent of that narrowly confined aspect of the legislation that was passed last year, and in effect, it would denigrate the ability of a large number of institutions in Division I-AA to use institution-specific aid such as Pell Grants for purposes of meeting the thresholds defined herein. And on that basis, I think it is incumbent upon this body to vigorously vote no with regard to No. 71.

Mr. Stephenson: Chancellor Fort, I would not disagree with you, but I think that the intent of Proposal No. 71-I is to make sure that the definition of financial aid that is used for the membership criteria requirements and for the FGE computation is identical. I don't think No. 71-1 specifies what that definition of financial aid is. I think Proposals 71-2 and 73 are identical enough that they define that definition of financial aid to be what you want it to be, and that is all institutional financial aid if I am not mistaken.

Mr. Fort: I do not disagree with your interpretation relative to Proposals 71-1 and 71-2, but I am not naive enough to anticipate that

hat 😽

______1992 Convention Proceedings

automatically those are shoo-ins. And so on that basis, I am still suggesting that if we do make the mistake of voting yes on Proposal No. 71, that will in fact abrogate the intent of previously passed legislation from 1991; and that we are opposed to. Additionally, it will really disenfranchise a significantly large number of Division I-AA institutions that have disproportionately large numbers of economically disadvantaged kids who depend upon institution-specific aid such as Pell Grants, etc. And therefore, I think that it would be moral turpitude for us to say yes on No. 71. I am urging no on No. 71.

Mr. Stephenson: How do you feel about Proposal 71-1? And let me ask you another question. Would it make any sense, or would people feel better, if the agenda was reordered and we considered Proposals 73 and 72 before we considered No. 71-1, because then we would know what in fact we were passing if we passed No. 71-1?

Mr. Fort: I would agree with you in this regard. If you will reorder the agenda so as to go with a vote on No. 71-1, and if we support No. 71-1 as a yes, then that will eliminate the abrogation ingredients associated with No. 71; in fact, eliminate it. So on that basis, I would say yes.

Carl F. Ullrich (Patriot League): I am not sure you have all seen this piece of paper that was prepared by the Council. Patty Viverito brought it up yesterday in the commissioners meeting. It really straightens out, I think, everybody's thinking on what will happen with these various amendments passing or not passing. That was very helpful to me. I didn't understand it until I saw this. If you have not seen it, I think it is available from the NCAA staff who distributed it yesterday. It really answers a lot of questions.

Mr. Crowley: The sheet of paper just described was handed out in the conference business sessions yesterday. It is headed Proposals No. 71 through 73. It has definitions of athletics aid and countable aid. It then describes each of the proposals with its amendments in terms of institutional-equivalency maximums and Division I membership criteria minimums. At the Division I business session, there will be copies of this paper that helps explain the complicated business we have just discussed. There will be copies available at the door.

Mr. Fort: Mr. Chair, let me make one more comment with regard to Proposal 71-1 versus No. 71. If you take a look at Proposal 71-1, paragraph B, parentheses A, the key issue as indicated by our colleagues is the phrase countable financial aid. Countable financial aid would therefore be inclusive of institution-specific aid and would therefore amend Proposal 71-B, parentheses A, line 2, athletics financial aid.

Now, if that is the intent of Jeff and my colleague, I will support it. In other words, the assumption is that if we pass Proposal 71-1 that the key phrase becomes No. 71-1-B, parentheses A, line 2, countable financial aid, and that countable financial aid is inclusive of institution-specific aid and therefore would abrogate parentheses A under No. 71. On that basis, then I am strongly urging that we pass Proposal 71-1 Division I-AA Business Session

with that understanding and therefore amend line B of parentheses A in No. 71. Right, Jeff?

Mr. Orleans: Yes. Mr. Chair, I have the feeling that even one more sentence on this may drive us all over the brink.

Mr. Crowley: It is entirely possible.

Mr. Orleans: And especially since Chancellor Fort and the two previous speakers, Carl Ullrich and Ron Stephenson, and I, are all trying to do the same thing. I think most people in this room are trying to do the same thing.

I think what Chancellor Fort said is correct. Proposal 71-1 will bring us back to having equivalency aid and membership aid counted the same way and counted inclusive not only of athletics aid but of other institutional grant or nonrepayable aid. If that passes, the issue then will be making sure that we do not get simply Proposal No. 72 unamended. And the next thing we will need to do is either amend Proposal No. 72 with No. 72-1 or pass Proposal 73. So, the three steps as I can see it are Proposal 71-1, and then No. 71 as amended, and then either No. 72-1 or No. 73. I hope my two friends will either tell me that I am right or wrong, but help us find the truth.

Mr. Ullrich: I must admit my mind is swirling a little bit with all the verbiage. But I would like to say that we feel strongly, just as Chancellor Fort said, that passage of Proposal No. 71 without No. 71-1 would be a crime. To go back on what we did last year, particularly in the area of qualification of Division I membership, would really be a terrible move.

Mr. Fort: I don't want to muddy the waters, Jeff, but if you look at Proposal No. 72, that is the worst-case scenario when basically that jeopardized the amendatory accomplishment associated with Proposal 71. Therefore, we should vote no on Proposal No. 72, vote yes on No. 71-1, with the key words being countable under parentheses A and B, and then that will then shift over to No. 71 with regard to parentheses B. [The Division I-AA business session was adjourned at 9:44 a.m.]

Division I-AAA
Business Session

Wednesday Morning, January 8, 1992

The Division I-AAA business session was convened at 8 a.m. by R. Elaine Dreidame, University of Dayton, chair.

[NOTE: Because no votes were taken in the session, the following is a summary of the discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

OPENING REMARKS

Chair Dreidame announced the proposals to be voted on at the Division I business session, those that would be withdrawn and those that had amendments-to-amendments. She indicated that the delegates were free to discuss any of them.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The delegates discussed various proposals to be considered during the Division I session and took straw votes on some of them. The first proposal considered was No. 16, Part A, which would increase the minimum cumulative high-school grade-point average for a partial qualifier in Division I from 2.000 to 2.500. In a straw vote, the Division I-AAA membership indicated it was not in favor of the proposal.

The membership of Division I-AAA also indicated it was not in favor of Proposal No. 21, which would establish minimum percentages of course requirements in a specific degree program at the beginning of the third, fourth and fifth year; No. 26, which would require a year of residency for partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers transferring from a two-year college, and No. 67, which would permit athletically related financial aid to be awarded to incoming freshman student-athletes to attend an institution's summer term, summer school or summer orientation period.

Proposal No. 30, which would provide summer financial aid to incoming student-athletes provided the student-athletes qualify for such financial aid on the same basis as other students generally, received favorable consideration in a straw vote. The Division I-AAA delegates were split regarding No. 25, which would eliminate the use of remedial, tutorial or noncredit courses to fulfill satisfactory-progress requirements. The delegates were overwhelmingly in favor of Proposal No. 72 if amended by No. 72-1

Division I-AAA Business Session

[NOTE: There were several other straw votes, but the transcript does not indicate the results.]

OTHER DISCUSSIONS

A lengthy discussion took place regarding the established formula for distribution of revenue from the Division I Men's Basketball Championship television contract. Much of the discussion related to the delegates' view that including grants-in-aid in football in the formula gave undue advantage to institutions sponsoring football and to public institutions. Several speakers expressed frustration with what they viewed as inequitable distribution of money. Finally, the delegates approved a resolution urging the NCAA Council, Presidents Commission and Executive Committee to reconsider and reformulate the revenue distribution formula in order that Division I-AAA institutions receive a more equitable share of those revenues.

[The Division I-AAA business session was adjourned at 9:20 a.m.]

Division II Business Session

Wednesday Morning, January 8, 1992

The Division II business session was called to order at 8 a.m. by Anthony F. Ceddia, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, Division II vice-president.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Ceddia: Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to call to order the Division II business session. I'm pleased to acknowledge President Edward Hammond of Fort Hays State University as our parliamentarian.

[NOTE: Various introductions, corrections to the Convention Program, voting instructions and other announcements were made.]

REVIEW OF DIVISION II PRESIDENTS SURVEY

Mr. Ceddia: Several months ago, the presidents of your colleges and universities were asked by the Division II Steering Committee to participate in a survey at the August Council meeting. While the Division II Steering Committee was meeting, it began to focus on what ought to be on the agenda for Division II during the next few years. It was decided at that steering committee meeting to establish a subcommittee to develop the survey, which eventually was distributed to the Division II membership. The subcommittee of the steering committee members included Bob Oliver, Rich Johanningmeier and Marge Trout.

The Division II Steering Committee decided that early in our business session, we would review with the membership the results of the survey. You should have received copies of the survey results. We thought it would be helpful if the subcommittee reported to the business session on the survey, because a number of the issues that we discussed in the survey may be of importance to you as you consider your vote on various proposals. Bob Oliver is the chair of the subcommittee. He will be assisted by Rich and Marge in the presentation. We will be using slides to help graphically demonstrate the results.

Robert A. Oliver (University of Northern Colorado): We would like to take quite a bit of time to review the survey results because this is an opportunity for the steering committee to get direct feedback from you in addition to the feedback we've already received from the survey. The survey developed as the steering committee started to take a position on the proposals that were coming before the 1992 Convention. We saw some things that we weren't sure of the position that we should take as your representatives to the NCAA Council. So we felt that we needed to get feedback from the membership as to where Division II wanted to go

ivision II Business Session	
	95

and what issues were of significant importance.

So therefore, we divided the survey into basically nine or 10 different areas—eligibility, financial aid, administrative responsibilities, coaching staff, playing and practice seasons, cost containment, membership requirements, championship selection, and other areas that we thought you wanted the NCAA national office to provide us with some? support. We are very pleased with the survey results. We had 134, or 61 \S percent of the membership, respond. We feel like that's a significant response. In fact, 20 to 30 responses were received after the November 26 deadline. But we felt we needed to have a cutoff, so we did not include those responses in the survey. In the development of the survey, we had numerous conference calls and field-tested the questionnaire to eliminate any questions as to what we were trying to get at. We felt very good about the elaboration that each of you took in giving us statements as opposed to just giving us "yes" and "no" answers or giving us percentages or giving us numbers. I think the last two pages of the survey, which we'll deal with at the end, where people have given us statements about things that we need to be concerned with, were very

The responses that we received were institutional positions. The survey was sent to the chief executive officers. The information we received was shared with athletics administrators or shared with people who are involved in athletics. It is an institutional position. We're going to go through, question by question, the responses, with some verbalization about them. After each question, we encourage those of you who have things to add, questions to ask, statements to make relative to each question, to do that. This is a very important time for the Division II Steering Committee to get feedback from the Division II membership. It's going to be very helpful as we proceed through 1992, '93 and '94 in setting agendas and looking at the direction for Division II.

I would like to call on Marge, who will go through Questions 1 through 8, and then Rich Johanningmeier, who will go through Questions 9 through 18. I'll come back at the end to conclude with the last two pages, and then try to summarize where we are and go from there.

Marjorie A. Trout (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): Thank you, Bob. This is a great opportunity to hear from you, as well as those of you who responded to the questionnaire. We would like to start with the first question on eligibility. The first question was whether we feel the existing 1.600, 1.800 and 2.000 grade-point averages are sufficient for Division II. If we can have the slide; we see that 97 people responded that 1.600, 1.800 and 2.000 were sufficient for eligibility, and 36 individuals said we need some changes.

Although it is not on your report, I would like to share some of those changes. We then can have your input. The general statement was that we need to increase the grade-point average (GPA). Individuals felt as though the 1.800 should be after the first year, then to a 2.000 in the

remaining years of eligibility.

Another area was to increase the number of credit hours required by the student-athletes during each semester. Some of the input that we received suggested the following: as high as 30 credits, to 27 hours per year; minimum of 12 per quarter, and total of 40 per year after the first year of residency; student-athletes entering the fourth year of collegiate enrollment, complete 50 percent of their degree program requirements; limit the availability to change curriculum degree programs in order to avoid confusion; semester by semester, check on satisfactory progress; institutional control to allow the institution to determine if the student is in good standing; and also, to suggest that we adopt Proposal Nos. 19, 20, and 21.

Proposal 19 deals with the mid-year transfer. Proposal 20 deals with the 75 percent during the academic year. And the percentage-degree requirement is Proposal 21. Let's see if there are some other thoughts or whether we would like to comment on those suggestions that were already given. This is a test to see if I can go back in the classroom to motivate you people.

Olin B. Sansbury (University of South Carolina at Spartanburg): I have a question about how you dealt with certain responses. My response to this particular question indicated that with the changes to be considered at this Convention, our continuing eligibility rules were sufficient. How was that kind of response put into the numbers you've got there?

Ms. Trout: You felt as though you would probably be one of the "yes" answers? Cappy, maybe you can speak to that.

Carol P. Powell (NCAA): That's right.

Ms. Trout: They would take that as a "yes," that the current legislation was sufficient.

Mr. Sansbury: But then someone who was responding on the basis of the existing legislation, and not taking into account the changes being proposed at this Convention, would also be a "yes."

Ms. Trout: No, I'm sorry. I misinterpreted your first question. You would have been a "no." And as I said, one of the areas was to adopt Proposals 19, 20, and 21. You did not feel that the 1.600, 1.800 and 2.000 were sufficient, so that was recorded as a "no." We then would incorporate your comments.

Mr. Sansbury: I guess that confuses me even more. Was that the only continuing-eligibility rule that you took into account? You didn't look at any of the other requirements for satisfactory progress?

Ms. Trout: Other than the passing of 24 credits from season to season.

Mr. Sansbury: So the responses to this question could really have been directed toward any number of rules that we have about current eligibility?

Ms. Trout: That's correct. Any other interest or suggestions? Again, this survey will give the steering committee some guidance as to what interests our constituents.

96	1992	Campana	Dunn
,,	 1992	Convention	rroceeaing

The next question concerns financial aid. Under the situation now in Division II, we must include earnings from student-athletes' employment during the academic year in determining whether their full grant-in-aid has been reached. We asked which of the following is most reasonable: A) "Employment income should be included in the determination of a full grant-in-aid for all sports"; B) "Employment income should not be included in the determination of a full grant-in-aid for all sports"; C) "Only student-athletes in the sports of football, men's and women's basketball, and ice hockey should include employment in determining a full grant-in-aid."

You can see that 46 individuals answered "A," that employment should be included in the full grant. In B, 83 responded that employment should not be included in the determination. And in C, four felt they should be included just in the sports of basketball and ice hockey.

The state of the s

Let's move to the question on the Pell Grant that asked if you believe the current rule should remain in effect, where the student-athlete will receive the moneys of the actual \$900. Eighty-two people responded that it should remain in effect; and 48 responded that it should not remain. If we could go to the next line, please. As you can see, 42 people responded "yes," 13 responded "no." I would like to share what else could be done if the answer was "no." Some of the responses were: \$900 over the full actual cost of attendance; \$1,000 over the full cost of attendance; \$1,600, or go to \$1,700, which is the same as Division I; and, up to the cost of attendance at each individual institution. Do we have any other feelings on the Pell Grant?

Let's move to the next question dealing with scholarships. If we could look at the men's sports first, you see we have on the report, as well as on the screen, permissible equivalencies, and then the mean of those who responded. The "N" stands for the number of people who responded. If you look down there, football, the 28.83, was the highest. Don't get excited when you look at ice hockey and see that we're allowed 15, and we're showing 20. That also incorporated institutions with Division I ice hockey programs. Could we now look at the women's? Again, the same principle, going across, the number responding. You can see basketball is 7.31 of the equivalency and is the mean of all of our schools. The next question is on the agenda this year as a proposal: "Should a reduction in the amount of financial aid that a Division II institution can provide be a consideration for cost-containment legislation in the future?" We had 74 respond "yes," 56 respond "no." It was interesting to see the suggestions of what we could do. I would like to share that.

First of all, to have scholarships in Division II based on need only. One comment said to make sure that we have fewer scholarships than Division I. Another was to reduce all scholarships, whether this would be by percentage, or individually. And the percentages input was 15, 25, up to 60 percent fewer scholarships. Another was that the scholarships would only include tuition, cost and books. Another was to have a subdivision in Division II for scholarships. We had a number of people

who addressed each sport and gave their input as to the number of scholarships that would be suggested. Let's remember that these were only suggestions to help guide us. I know that scholarships are a great concern in Division II. At this time, we would like to entertain suggestions or comments on our situation with the scholarships. I hope this means that you are satisfied with the survey results. Thank you.

Richard A. Johanningmeier (Washburn University of Topeka):
Question No. 9 was put into the survey to determine the burden in regard to administrative paperwork. I'm going to sum up Nos. 9, 10 and 11. There was a general response in Division II that NCAA paperwork was overwhelming; that Division II is understaffed to do the required paperwork; that Division I rules are inappropriate for Division II; that eligiblation has become overburdensome and that there are a number of budgetary concerns regarding the legislation. There were also quite a few people concerned about the paperwork required in graduation rates, financial aid and recruiting.

In regard to titles and ranges of responsibilities for compliance, we found a range of titles and of individuals who have administrative duties in Division II athletics departments across the country. We also found a range of approximately 16 areas of responsibility that are assigned to athletics directors on the Division II level. If anyone has any suggestions, questions or comments regarding the direction Division II should take in future legislation that has to do with the administrative burden, now is the time to speak up. As legislation comes forth, keep these in mind in the developmental stages.

- Mr. Sansbury: I'm very concerned about the way this question was structured. And I'm very concerned about what it might lead the steering committee to propose. First of all, I think the question was a little too open-ended in what you were trying to get people to respond to. I know when I put this questionnaire out to the various members of our athletics department, the response I got from my athletics director was very clear. He was not responding to the administrative burden. He was responding in terms of complaints he had about rules related to recruitment and rules related to the practice seasons and playing seasons. So I'm concerned that your responses from many people may have been more directed toward the particular rule rather than to the administrative burden. And I would caution you in proposing anything here. I think we have to deal with the reality that many of these things that we're trying to address—many of these rules that we are putting in-are dealing with criticisms of intercollegiate athletics. If we don't assume the administrative burden of trying to implement and oversee, somebody else is going to dictate to us what that administrative burden might be. So I hope that the committee will not jump on these responses as a mandate to overturn some of these rules and regulations that we've

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): I would like to support the committee's actions in terms of the substance of this. It would be helpful if in the future this was mailed before the

Convention so we have an opportunity to analyze it. But I would like to say that from the standpoint of at least several of the institutions that I'm familiar with, that we certainly do find that there is a tremendous workload and that there are some major differences between the Division I approach and Division II, not only in terms of staffing, but also in terms of substantive issues that really don't pertain to Division II. I'm glad to see and encourage the steering committee, particularly in the future, to take the kind of action that's appropriate for Division II.

Mr. Johanningmeier: We'll move to Question No. 12: "Do you have an employee whose primary responsibility is administering compliance?" I think we also could look at that question in the same light as some of the others in that they are open-ended. But based on survey results, the athletics director or the compliance coordinator has the primary responsibility for compliance in Division II. In some cases, an assistant athletics director or associate athletics director were primarily the individuals who were doing the compliance. We were interested in finding how many Division II institutions have a "full-time compliance officer." We were trying to get an idea and this question provided that. Any questions or suggestions in regard to the administrative compliance on the Division II level?

Question No. 14, which we will combine with Question No. 15: "Should placing a limit on the number of coaches be a consideration for cost-containment legislation?" There were 85 positive responses and 48 "no" responses. Here's where the Division II Steering Committee needs a lot of assistance from you. You're going to see from these ranges that some of them almost get ridiculous. We need something from the membership we can live with if we move in this direction. Suggestions in baseball range from one coach to two full-time coaches; in basketball, from two full-time coaches and two restricted-earnings coaches, to one full-time coach and two part-time coaches; in cross country, just one coach; in football, the range was from six full-time and six part-time coaches, to just having four coaches on the Division II level; in track, there was a range from having one coach to three; in volleyball, the range was also from one coach to three; in soccer, a range from two and one restricted-earnings coach, to just one coach; in softball, from two full-time coaches and one restricted-earnings coach, to just one; and in wrestling, from two coaches, to three. These are the basic responses.

As you can see, if you're trying to think seriously about future legislation with the ranges that we have, somewhere along the line in Division II we have to come together and we have to come to some compromises. We have to do some thinking as to what is the appropriate $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($ number of coaches in football and in basketball and all throughout the

Rev. Kevin G. O'Connell (Le Moyne College): In order to reflect on the meaning of the very wide range of responses, I think we need a little more analysis of how many different people are reflected. I can envision that one or two people could have wanted to cut a number of sports, or vice versa, or one or two people wanted large limits in several different

_____ 1992 Convention Proceedings

sports. We need to have a sense of the support for the different approaches. I think it's worthwhile pointing out.

Mr. Johanningmeier: I think a survey that listed all the sports and number of full-time, part-time and volunteer coaches to get some idea as to the number of coaches in each particular sport might be helpful. Gene A. Carpenter (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): I want to make sure that we're all Division II in here and support this survey. I certainly support the man from Bakersfield. I'm really concerned about some of the rules that we have put in over the last several years. We have locked ourselves into Division I so much that we are causing a lot of frustration for the athletics directors. And I hope there are presidents in here who might listen to that and look at this survey.

Let me give you an example of the proposal that we passed that nobody else addressed; a rule that we must document every youngster we talk to when we're recruiting. In Division I, that's not bad with eight or nine full-time coaches, summer recruiting programs and so forth. Each of those coaches might have five athletes who they deal with.

¿ But my coaches in Division II go on the road to the high schools. We don't have the luxury of just wanting to talk to Athlete A. That head coach, on a PR venture, wants us to maybe talk to two or three other kids on that squad. After a week on the road, my coaches have visited with 80-some coaches that they have to document. Each coach is spending one hour a day documenting his recruiting visits. That is unnecessary in Division II. There are other examples; I didn't want to jump to new legislation.

I think too much legislation has been passed without having been thoroughly looked at. And we go ahead and pass these items because of the encouragement of the Presidents Commission. And most of them with good intentions. Most apply to Division I and they should be there. But I tell you what, we have 82 percent of the people responding to this survey saying that we have too much to do in Division II for the staff that we have. I think that's the area that we need to address. If we need new rules to get out of the Division I lock-up, then we should put those

Mr. Johanningmeier: Thank you, Gene. Any other comments?

Question No. 16, "Should a reduction in length of playing seasons be considered for cost-containment legislation?" There were 82 "no" responses, and 51 "yes" responses. The responses basically boil down to these areas: the suggestion to reduce playing seasons and the number of contests in Division II; to eliminate the nontraditional segments in Division II; to alter the format for off-season practice, and also to shorten the preseason practice periods. Does anyone have any concrete suggestions in regard to reducing playing seasons any further as part of the cost-containment legislation?

Question No. 17, "Is the current rule governing scheduling requirements sufficient?" We had 105 "yes" responses, 28 "no" responses. However, we did have some very interesting comments. One is, and I

Division II Business Session	
	10)

think appropriately, that possibly this issue needs further study. Suggestions in regard to contests ranged from requiring an institution in football and basketball contests to play anywhere from 50 to 80 percent of their contests against Division I and II opponents. One responded that 75 to 80 percent of all contests should be against Division II opponents; and 60 percent of football contests should be played versus Division I or Division II opponents. In basketball, some feel that as many as 85 percent of the contests should be played against Divisions I and II opponents. This question will lock in with the championship question somewhat. But does anyone have any further comments, ideas or suggestions regarding what's in the legislation currently insofar as governing our schedule requirements? As you know, it's just a 50 percent requirement. Any suggestions regarding the

THE RESERVE THE PROPERTY OF THE PERSON OF TH

Question No. 18 dealt with whether the current process and criteria for selection of participants for championships is sufficient. We had a number of different areas that were commented upon. No. 1, the selection process is too political. No. 2, concern regarding the strength of the schedule of the teams that are selected to play. Some felt that there should be a clear objective and a public criteria in regard to the selection process. Some felt that the conference champions and the very-next-best teams regardless of the geographical locations should be selected for championship play. Another suggestion was to use a power-rating index. Another, in football and basketball, only contests against Divisions I and II should be considered regarding the selection of postseason play. Another suggested limiting the people who can contact the selection committee members.

Several independent schools felt that they have little or no representation on the committees and that the overall selection process does not provide them the same opportunities for postseason play as conference members. Some felt there should be better balance between the selection of the best teams and the regional representatives. And there were a number of concerns regarding the composition of the selection committee. We had ranges from, it should be done by NCAA staff members, to putting on more administrators and fewer coaches, etc. So this is an area along with the criteria for contest that we wanted to find out what you all thought. Are there any other ideas, suggestions or areas that you would like to discuss on this matter, on postseason championships or the criteria for scheduling? Thank you.

Mr. Oliver: The next question dealt with trying to reduce costs. We talked about cost reduction and cost containment. We do some things that probably are not very prudent when we come on a Sunday or a Monday and spend \$800 for an airline ticket when we could have come two days earlier and spent \$200 for an airline ticket. I think that was an issue we dealt with in the Division II Steering Committee. If we started a day earlier, we could reduce our costs significantly in airline fares or motel expense by not coming on Saturday and sitting around until Tuesday. I think the response is obvious. A number of people thought

ıntil

the Convention should be held over a Saturday night to help reduce costs. We appreciate that kind of response so that we can carry it to the people who plan the Convention.

The next question asked for cost reduction ideas. Many of those suggestions are incumbent upon us as member institutions to come forward at the Convention with legislation that would cause that to happen. And we have one significant piece of legislation that's very controversial—Convention Proposal No. 64—in reducing just scholarships. I think that was one of the main reasons that the steering committee thought that it needed to do a survey as opposed to just being concerned about cost containment; to find other areas that the Division II membership feels we should be concerned with. Because whether we want to believe it or not, each of us needs to be concerned about cost containment.

suggestions to reduce costs through legislative changes. We talk about limiting recruiting time, limiting scholarships, limiting playing seasons. You can go on and on. I think we need dialogue and feedback from you; some more specific kinds of feedback relative to legislation that you put together as a conference or you put together as a group of member institutions relative to ways that Division II can deal with cost containment. Are there things that you would like to discuss relative to cost containment and cost reduction from your institution or conference or individual standpoint? Other reactions to comments we received could be institutional or conference-oriented, where we could control or you could control your own destiny relative to where you want to prioritize cost containment.

I know some conferences have limitations on scholarships that are below the NCAA limits, which is permissive. We know that some conferences have eliminated or reduced spring football or reduced nontraditional seasons. Some of that may be dealt with individually. However, we come back to the same issue. We want to have a level playing field so that our athletes and coaches have an equal opportunity to compete. And sometimes it is very hard for us to impose upon ourselves restrictions that are not consistent with national regulations. I encourage each of you to seriously look at where we want to go with cost containment. I think it needs to be addressed across the board in Division II, Division I and Division III. But I think we need to be concerned about where we're going with Division II.

Question No. 21 asked about services that the NCAA should provide in order to enhance Division II. Many of your suggestions already have been initiated. An initial-eligibility clearinghouse is being pursued from a resolution two years ago. A committee is working on establishing an initial-eligibility clearinghouse that could eliminate some paperwork on each member institution's campus. There is software that's being specifically developed to deal with graduation-rate requirements. It was developed initially for Division I. Through the encouragement of the Division II Steering Committee, there is some software being

developed that will be available to the membership for graduation-rate disclosure information. This spring's regional seminars will have some Division II specific sessions. Legislative services and the compliance department are going to provide some specific feedback to us in the regional seminars this spring.

I think we've moved significantly into the federated approach to legislation. We probably need to expand that. Some people probably would like to have that totally. I'm not sure that's feasible. But I think we're moving to a federated approach in dealing with Division II issues that are not being driven by Division I. This year there was an is orientation for new members of the NCAA that was held Tuesday morning, which was a suggestion about what the NCAA can do. And hopefully that will be beneficial for new members of the Association. The enforcement department can provide each of us with a reference check. If we're in the process of hiring somebody, we can contact the enforcement department and it can run a check to see if that person has? been involved in enforcement violations.

The greatest area of response was for the NCAA to provide funding assistance. As we're all aware, we have the opportunity to decide how the enhancement money to institutions and conferences is distributed. Conferences have received between \$20,000 and \$35,000. That amount of money is going to be increased. Each institution, depending upon how successful it was, received money. I think we need to prioritize how we're using the enhancement money that's being distributed to Division II. I think that we may need to reprioritize how we're going to use that money based upon the feedback from the survey.

You did a great job in responding to the survey. We appreciate your feedback. And I think it's a point well-taken that it would have been beneficial if it had been possible to get this distributed prior to your arrival so you had time to really study it and be better prepared to respond to some of these areas that we identified. But we do not see this as an ending process. We strongly encourage you to go back to your campus and share this information with your constituents—whether it's your president, whether it's your faculty, your athletics committee, or whether it's your coaches—and to give us feedback on where we need to go with this. Either give that to us verbally, or we strongly encourage that you give your suggestions to us in writing. We want to see this as an ongoing process to be able to respond to your needs. Question or

Herb Reinhardt (Valdosta State College): I have a suggestion. I'm a new athletics director. I would like to see the NCAA provide a publication that has a time frame for the forms that need to be filled out over the course of a year. I don't know if that is available. I have not been able to come across that yet.

Mr. Oliver: There is a notebook that's available to each member institution from the compliance department that outlines that for you, Herb. I think that would be of great benefit and answer a lot of the questions. You may get overwhelmed when you read what we need to

. 1992 Convention Proceedings

do. but it is a great guide.

Frank Cignetti (Indiana University of Pennsylvania): I have two comments that I feel are very important to the quality of experience that we give to our student-athletes at the Division II level. One is the grant-in-aid model we're utilizing. We talk about cost effectiveness, cutting costs, reducing grant-in-aid and so forth. I think we want to be sure that we don't deny student-athletes an opportunity. Secondly, at the same time we want to be cost effective. I would like to recommend that the membership and steering committee study a tuition-plus-need concept for the grant-in-aid in Division II. That would give more students an opportunity. It could be cost effective and at the same time it will not affect the quality of our program. As we know, recruiting is not an exact science. We make a lot of mistakes in recruiting studentathletes. We can invest a lot of money in one particular athlete. So if we put some type of maximum—in terms of tuition, in terms of books—I , think it would help our grant-in-aid package in Division II.

Mr. Johanningmeier: Frank, could you elaborate on that a little bit?

Mr. Cignetti: Here's what I'm recommending. Let's say at the present level we have equivalency maxes in Division II that you have a choice to either offer a young man a full scholarship, tuition or \$1,000. I'm recommending for Division II that we make the maximum grant-inaid a tuition grant, whatever tuition costs at your institution. Any aid the young man receives above that tuition grant would be based on need. The Pell Grant, or whatever your state grant is, is what he would get. He would get that based on need. The maximum commitment that the institution would make would be grant-in-aid, would be the tuition, or tuition and fees, tuition and books, whatever the membership feels would be best. This way, it's going to reduce the equivalencies here today and at the same time we're going to give more young people an opportunity to participate, because now you can just double whatever you reduce it to. More young people will have the opportunity to participate. We won't affect the quality of our product and at the same time we'll be more cost efficient in administering financial aid.

Mr. Johanningmeier: I'm going to keep you on the spot for a minute. I'm intrigued by that to some degree. Do you then see the athletics aid the individual receives, let's use just his tuition, that that would be the only countable aid against your equivalencies? Or would you still have your countable aid in those other areas that are "need

Mr. Cignetti: I would have to study that. But right now, I would say the countable aid would be the tuition grant. The rest of it would be

Mr. Johanningmeier: And that would not be countable?

Mr. Cignetti: That would not be countable.

Mr. Johanningmeier: So you still couldn't exceed the aid.

Mr. Cignetti: Right.

Mr. Johanningmeier: But broken down, you would only...

. .	we will only
Division II Business Session	
	10

Mr. Cignetti: I'm talking about the amount of aid that we administer as institutions, grant figures. Do we have any comment or question on that before I go to the second one?

The second question I have is about the size of coaching staffs. I'm concerned about the quality of experience of our student-athletes, that they have a chance to be in our program and develop their abilities to the maximum. I suggest that before the steering committee would legislate size of coaching staffs, that it would get a good cross-section of the coaches and meet with them on what is the optimum number of coaches we should have for our program. I think we need information from our coaches to see what we really need to offer the maximum experience for our student-athletes.

Mr. Oliver: Just one comment on that, Frank. The steering committee, would not legislate that. The members would legislate that.

Mr. Cignetti: I understand that. Sorry.

Terrence J. Toy (University of Denver): I have a couple of items to speak to very briefly. First of all, as a philosophical matter, I'm concerned that one effect of the recent legislation has been to substitute dollars spent on operation of athletics programs for dollars spent on cost of compliance. I'm concerned that we may not be saving the kind of money we think we're saving because we're putting that money we used to use for operations of the athletics programs to the direct benefit of the student-athletes, now into the cost of hiring compliance or additional support people to fulfill those requirements. We need to be careful about the amount of paperwork we're willing to vote in and the amount of volunteer time, specifically faculty athletics representative time, that we're willing to contribute on their behalf.

Secondly, I'm concerned that we don't really look systematically at what I consider to be testable hypotheses. The correlations assumed last year between academic performance and the length of season or the number of competitions, I think is a testable hypothesis we can look at in the coming years. For example, I find quite frequently that our student-athletes perform better during the season of competition than they do afterwards because of structuring part of their lives during the season of competition. Based upon the rule changes last year and in the coming years, I think we have a testable hypothesis. We can look at individual grade-point averages and see if there is a correlation that would substantiate that kind of legislation or if it's an assumption that isn't valid.

And finally, I'm concerned as the faculty representative about the reduction in number of coaches. The coach who is most likely to be lost—the one who is most closely associated with the student, tries to develop a personal link with the student—is probably the academic adviser for that student. I think the person who does the recruiting and the head coaches are always going to be there. My concern is that the person who has the most direct concern with the academic performance of the student-athletes is most likely to be the coach who is going to be terminated. I think we need to be very careful about that. And secondly,

106 ______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

another issue that we need to consider in terms of reduction of coaches is the liability. Not just whether we're providing them with the optimum competitive environment, but also what will the attorneys believe to be adequate supervision. Eliminating a coach could possibly esubject ourselves to liability and litigation.

Arnold Lockett (Winston-Salem State University): On Question 21: What can the NCAA provide for Division II?" There are 41 items listed. How are these going to be prioritized? Specifically, I think Division II could reap the same benefits as Division I from more TV exposure. I think the message going to the general public throughout the United States is that Division I includes all institutions. I think if we had the same advantage as Division I in the television exposure, it would help all of us. The question is, how are these going to be prioritized as to what can the NCAA do to help us?

Mr. Oliver: I defer to anyone on the steering committee relative to how we're going to prioritize. This is my personal response: No. 1, I'm not sure that we as a steering committee are going to prioritize. This is an initial effort to get some feedback from the members. We hope when you go back to your campuses or conferences that this will trigger proposals for future Conventions and for some written feedback as to what things that are priorities for you as member institutions or conferences. So I don't think we have any ownership to this as a steering committee. It's going to give us some direction. Responses will help us determine the membership's priorities. I would defer to anyone else who wants to respond.

Mr. Ceddia: The steering committee certainly will continue to discuss the results and sift through the data that it's gathered. I think it's clear that any survey is imperfect to begin with. Legitimate questions can be raised about the style of questions, whether or not certain questions dealt with the intent or whether we may have uncovered some unanticipated results in looking at the data. So we intend to correspond with all Division II chief executive officers after this Convention, share with them a copy of this survey, ask them to again sit down with their staffs to go over the results, and then provide us with some feedback in terms of priority actions that we ought to consider. The steering committee is attempting to open up channels of communication between and among the membership that quite honestly we didn't think existed. Albeit the survey can be questioned in terms of validity and reliability, it was an attempt to do exactly that. The reason we wanted to start this morning with the results was to encourage some dialogue and interaction from the membership with the steering committee so that over the next few months we can develop an action plan that might lead to some type of strategic directions for the steering committee over the next two to five years.

This would parallel what's happening with the Presidents Commission. For example, it has set forth a three-year plan. The NCAA Council is about to mirror that strategic planning process so that there can be greater collaboration between the Council and the Presidents Commis-

Division II Business Session	107
	111/

sion. It would seem reasonable for Division II to do that in relationship to its constituents and see if we can't put together some initiative that would be in the long-term best interests of the membership, particularly the student-athletes we serve.

Mr. Lockett: We support the actions of the steering committee. But I think we also have some very important issues that have been brought forth, and ask now for some guidance as to how we move some of these forward.

Mr. Oliver: To respond to the TV issue, I think that goes back to the antitrust legislation that removed the NCAA from being able to negotiate TV packages, specifically in the area of regular-season football. I think that's a "Catch 22" that Division II is in because we have some quality competition that should receive exposure on regional and national TV. I think that's in the hands of the NCAA and it's incumbent upon us as institutions. That's kind of like climbing Mount Everest on a day-to-day basis because it's just not there. I agree with you. Hopefully something can be done, but I'm not sure it can.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): I would like to follow my colleague, Terry Toy, with a philosophic observation. As we prepare to vote, many Division II issues will impact Divisions I and III. I would like to remind Division II that we have supported the federated concept. We have benefited from Division II's and Division III's cooperation in the past. Many of you who are at big-city institutions, primarily black institutions, have benefited from the support from Divisions I and III to eliminate the five-year rule in our division and in Division III. We only pulled it off because Division I supported this. That's why we don't have the five-year rule anymore. I would like to emphasize that instead of thinking parochially that we should think in a cooperative way. Not adversarially. At times this morning I've thought maybe we weren't there yesterday when Dick Schultz spoke. Cost containment doesn't just apply to Division I. The threat of a Congressional takeover doesn't just apply to Division I. The reason there is so much paperwork, Gene, is that we have to clean up our act. I've been hearing over the last 24 hours the Division II conference commissioners saying we have to defeat that Division I-AAA football proposal because they will get the TV money and it will be an advantage for Division I over Division II.

That's the way we argued 10 and 15 years ago. I was right there arguing with you. But that's smoke-filled-room arguing. There is a bigger issue in all of this—higher education in the United States. Have we been reading? Again, our educational program in the United States is at risk. So I would urge that we consider taking the high road when voting on these issues. Division II does have an image problem. I think part of it is that we're parochial sometimes and we're always thinking about competitive edges. And we used to belong to another organization. And we used to hear those arguments about competitive edges instead of will this be good for higher education in the United States? Will this be good for the academic integrity of our institutions? So I urge us this

108 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

morning, this afternoon and tomorrow, not just to think about our own advantages, but what's best for higher education, for the NCAA at large.

Robert Entzion (North Dakota State University): Sometimes I think in Division II that we don't have our own brains and we're following everything they do in Division I. And I look at a couple of things: The big cutbacks in Division I, our scholarships and staff. I'm division director for academics and athletics at North Dakota State. I know in our academic program if we cut back coaching staffs, our university president is going to have to hire new faculty. Our people are teaching from a 30-percent load to a 60-percent load, plus they are coaching. I think there are a lot of similarities here. We're talking about scholarship cutbacks in Division II. We are taking away opportunities for students to be at universities. I can think of many ways that we can be innovative and cut back. We just went through a Christmas tournament. I don't know how many schools make money at Christmas tournaments. We're not Division I. We have teams staying two or three days at Christmas and we're spending money to keep them in the dorms and eat off campus. Let's cut out all of our Christmas breaks. Send people home to be with their parents where they should be. There are many ways to save money without taking away from student-athletes.

Wallace Jackson (Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Yes, Division II commissioners did go on record as opposing Division I-AAA. We intend to do that. In terms of cooperation with Division I and Division III, yes, we have received cooperation. But that has also been a reciprocal agreement. Division III has asked this body to help it keep Division I schools from playing Division III football. We have done that. But at the same time, the speaker fails to acknowledge that Division III apparently suffers from amnesia and lockjaw now that we need some support on that same issue. We're simply saying Division I has made an overt attempt to separate itself from us. And that's fine. But if you want to be in the heavyweight division, you can't come with cruiser-weight credentials. So yes, we did oppose it, we will oppose it. And the schools of the so-called big cities—I don't know what that meant—but the only thing we've ever asked for from this body is a sense of equity and fair play.

Mr. Ceddia: I appreciate the comments on Division I-AAA football, but I'm going to use the prerogative of the Chair to suggest to the membership that that's a matter we ought to discuss later in the agenda. Let's keep focused on the survey.

David Dolch (Morningside College): I would like to commend the steering committee on its work. But I'm here to speak regarding cost containment.

I came directly from the American Football Coaches Association convention Monday, where I was at the Division II business meeting. I'm here to speak specifically about Proposal No. 64 and the work that was done by our steering committee.

First of all, I believe that Proposal 64 lacks some comprehensive

Division II Business Session	 100

studies. I think that the steering committee would agree with that. These reductions in scholarships have not been studied in a comprehensive way to see how they would adversely affect our women's programs and our minority institutions. This proposal needs further study.

Mr. Oliver: Dave, I would like to focus on the survey and not talk about specific proposals, i.e., Proposal 64. I would like to discuss that

Mr. Dolch: I would like to wrap up by saying that we need to understand that when we attack these scholarships, let's not be piloted by Division I. We do have a freedom of choice in terms of breaking up our scholarships, whether that's a full scholarship or a small proportion of a scholarship. I would like to continue to see it done that way.

Mr. Ceddia: Ladies and gentlemen, you make me feel right at home. I feel like I'm at a faculty meeting. This is great. Let me again remind you that we're trying to wrap up our discussion of the survey and that we will have ample opportunity to discuss specific proposals that are before this Convention. But for this time frame, let's stay on the general topics of the survey. Certainly cost containment is one of them. But let us not get embroiled in discussing specific proposals at this time.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): As the president of my university, our faculty rep and I prepared to come to the Convention and look at the legislation that Division II currently sponsors, which in large part has come from Division I, the president's response was "This is getting very, very difficult. We're tying people up in the office of the dean of administrative services. We're tying people up in the registrar's office."

Yesterday I had the privilege of meeting with 15 or 16 Division II institutions on the West coast, primarily California, and found that there was a good feeling about the fact that we are over-legislative. The response to Rudy Carvajal's comments and the speaker following Rudy who received quite a response would indicate that while my president felt all of the upcoming legislation is going to pass because it's the Presidents Commission's recommendations, it appears Division II does feel it is overly legislative. Without losing that issue of legislation, it is excessive. It is killing smaller institutions with no assistant athletics directors, no compliance officers. Staying in compliance is a very difficult problem for a lot of institutions out here. We have some proposals coming up in respect to that legislation that are going to increase the paperwork and the use of personnel who have nothing to do with athletics. I'm hoping Division II representatives will look at that legislation and not add to the problem that we currently have. And hopefully in the succeeding Convention we can eliminate some of the legislation that is really inappropriate for Division II.

Mr. Oliver: Seeing no one else at the mike, let me conclude with a couple of comments. One, I encourage you again to take this information back to your campuses. Give us as much feedback as you want to give us. Give us as much direction as a steering committee as possible. We

need that, and we surely encourage that. I think that the 15 summary statements on the first two pages of the survey are very good relative to giving a direction from the survey. I think those 15 statements should be read, and then you can refer to the charts.

I would like at this time to recognize Cappy Powell. Cappy is our staff liaison and was the person who worked directly with the three of us in drafting the survey, getting it back to us, redoing it and compiling the results of the survey in a timely fashion so it would be ready for this Convention. The survey went out October 22. The results were back November 22. I would like to recognize Cappy Powell for a job very well done. Thank you for all your comments. Hopefully, this is a movement in the right direction for Division II.

Mr. Ceddia: Ladies and gentlemen, I think we ought to acknowledge the work of the subcommittee—Bob Óliver, Rich Johanningmeier and Marge Trout. They did a great job and spent a lot of time on this. As I indicated earlier, the chief executive officers will receive a copy of the survey. Hopefully they will share it with their staffs. You, as members of the Division II business session, also should feel free to react to the survey. If you would like, you could send me written responses in care of the NCAA national office. Cappy Powell will be responsible for consolidating those responses. We will make sure in the discussion upcoming at the April Council meeting, when we will again be breaking offinto steering committees, to review your suggestions and continue to forge ahead in trying to identify a plan of action over the next couple of

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Ceddia: At this time, it's traditional in the Division II business session to review the legislative proposals. In keeping with past practice, we have asked various members of the steering committee to present, in seriation, the proposals. We will go through all the proposals even though we will not be voting in a federated fashion on some of them. This will give you an opportunity to ask questions, make comments and to pursue additional information from the staff. We thought that if we went through the proposals and later in the agenda got involved in the formal voting, that would give us an opportunity to learn something new or refine some information that we have regarding the specific proposals. So at this time, we will begin with the review of

Consent Package

Ollie Bowman (Hampton University): I have the easier part of the program, the consent package. There are 13 proposals in the package. They are either proposed by the Presidents Commission or the Council and they can be voted either in bulk, or if there is an objection to any one of them, it will be pulled out and we would vote on it separately. I ask you to turn your attention to the first 13 proposals of the consent

Proposal No. 1 allows the Presidents Commission to dispense with the roll-call vote should an amendment appear to be overwhelmingly

110	1992 Convention	Proceedings
-----	-----------------	-------------

accepted. By the same token, it would allow it to identify roll-call proposals before the Convention begins.

Proposal No. 2 allows the Presidents Commission to choose its internal operations, its own committees, length of office and those kinds of things.

Proposal No. 3 allows an institution to certify one of its delegates as a female, to have four delegates instead of the three that now are certified. This would encourage and increase participation of women in the Convention and in the NCAA.

Proposal No. 4 has to do with cost considerations. Last year we passed legislation that required that any proposal that came forward to have with it cost considerations. Proposal No. 4 would eliminate that requirement but does not say that the Commission or the Council could not require those considerations after the adoption of the proposal.

Proposal No. 5 prevents any persons on the athletics staff from acting as an intermediary in the marketing of a student-athlete or acting as an intermediary between a student and an agent, for example.

Proposal No. 6 prohibits member conferences from becoming involved in the recruitment of prospective student-athletes.

Proposal No. 7 simply says that an institution may not provide expenses for amateur competition during vacation periods. If it does, the students stand to be in danger of losing competition eligibility. There is an interpretation of Proposal No. 7 that exempts any competition that started before this Convention began. It exempts that competition from this legislation because all of this consent legislation has an immediate start-up date.

Proposal No. 8 is Satisfactory Progress for a Nonrecruited, Nonparticipating Athlete. This is an exception. If a student was a walk-on, was not recruited, and came up for tryouts but did not go any further, this would not count as a season of competition for him or her.

Proposal No. 9, the residence requirement for two-year college transfers, simply says that if students enroll after the 12th day of the semester or quarter, they cannot use that term to satisfy residency requirements. Before, this applied only to students transferring from four-year colleges.

Proposal No. 11, Bowl Game Awards, provides that a student-athlete who participates in certified bowl games can receive up to \$300 without it being counted as aid. It can be counted as outside. Same thing that we do now with NCAA championships.

Proposal No. 12, Travel Expenses for Preseason Games; there are two games that are mentioned: National Football Foundation Hall of Fame and the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game. Students who participate in either of those games can be allowed to participate in pregame activities even though classes have begun on their campuses.

Proposal No. 13, Fall Preseason Practice Opportunities, simply permits member institutions whose campuses are closed, whose dormitories are closed, and where students must seek outside accom-

modations, not to count those days in the countable days for preseason practice.

(A) [The meeting was recessed for 15 minutes.]

Presidents Commission Grouping

Anthony F. Ceddia: After being cajoled and rebuked and encouraged by a couple of you and caucusing with the steering committee, we will modify what some have referred to as an ancient and beloved tradition of going through all of the proposals. Instead of having steering committee members lead us through all of the proposals, I suggest that we offer them in blocks. If you have questions on the proposals in each one of those blocks, we can take time to discuss it. Steering committee members who have prepared information on those proposals would be willing to share their thoughts with you.

With that in mind, I ask you to look at the Presidents Commission package—Initial and Continuing Eligibility, Proposals 14 through 25. Please note that the sponsors for Proposal No. 17 have indicated their intent to withdraw it. It would be a moot proposal for Division I if No. 15-B or No. 16-B is adopted. So please note that the sponsors of Proposal 17 have indicated their intent to withdraw it. There are two interpretations in this package as well. They are for Proposal Nos. 20 and 21.

Kenneth Rebman (California State University, Hayward): I have a question about No. 20. Many institutions, my own included, are year-round operations. The summer quarter is not particularly distinguished from any other quarters in the year. Was this given consideration in the proposal?

Mr. Ceddia: My understanding is that there is to be an amendment-to-amendment to provide for a waiver possibility to deal with exactly that type of situation. It's Proposal No. 20-1.

G. Ann Uhlir (Texas Woman's University): The question arose at the faculty representatives meeting about when correspondence courses would be counted. Has an interpretation been made about when correspondence courses would be counted?

Mr. Ceddia: Yes, I think that we're going to try to get an interpretation. But are those courses appearing on the transcript? Are they preregistered courses and then appearing on the transcript?

Ms. Uhlir: Students with enrollment correspondence courses normally could complete it at any point. Whenever the course is completed.

Mr. Ceddia: I think right now the interpretation indicates that if they are enrolled in that course during a specific semester, even if they don't complete that course during that semester, i.e., through a correspondence course, then it would be credited against that semester that they were enrolled.

Jack McAvoy (Hillsdale College): I would like to go back to Proposal No. 14. Did anyone from the Council check with any of the secondary schools before this was written up? In talking to a principal from a Class C school and a superintendent from a Class D school in Michigan, they both told me that this would be a hardship as far as their schools

ings	1 2 2	Division II Business Session	

were concerned academically. They felt that they did not have the faculty and the money to take care of this provision. I was wondering if anyone from the Council had checked with any secondary schools before this was proposed?

Mr. Ceddia: My understanding is that there was consultation. Is there a member of the Academic Requirements Committee here who might want to speak to this?

Mr. McAvoy: I'm talking about smaller schools.

Kendrick W. Walker (California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo): The Academic Requirements Committee did check with secondary schools. As many of you know, an increase from 11 to 15 was recommended. Many high schools across the nation could not react that quickly, so as a matter of compromise the Academic Requirements Committee recommended a level of 13.

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): A comment about Proposal No. 21. Regarding the increase in this proposal, and that is in reference to transfer students through this legislation, it seems to me that that would be a very difficult thing to do given the fact that your degree requirements vary so much from institution to institution. It would require a great deal more transferable degree credit. Also, I think I saw in The NCAA News that the Division II Steering Committee opposes this proposal. Is that correct?

Mr. Ceddia: Both the Council and the Presidents Commission are sponsoring that proposal, Bruce. The Division II Steering Committee was not supportive of this issue because it felt the existing eligibility requirements that are in place ought to stand the test of time and be

Dorothy E. Dreyer [Wayne State University (Michigan)]: Bruce, there also is a waiver provision that's been written into Proposal No. 21. But the process for granting those waivers has not yet been determined. So that may help with the transfer student when that waiver process is determined.

Mr. Ceddia: Just to go back to that earlier question about the correspondence course. I want to call the delegates' attention to Page No. 2 on the interpretations sheet. It would be 3-F. The last sentence indicates that when an incomplete grade has been removed, that the course will be accepted for grade. It must be counted either during the term in which the student-athlete initially enrolled in the course or during the term in which the incomplete grade was removed and an acceptable credit was awarded. So just a little different twist than we said earlier, but I wanted to note that. Dorothy Dreyer will be helping me out on the first part of the Presidents Commission proposals.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): Proposal No. 21 refers to a two-year student having passed 25 units toward a specific baccalaureate program. What about the junior-college transfer who began as a freshman as a full-time student and after three years has gone two semesters as a full-time student and four terms as a part-time student then transfers to the member institution? Is that transfer not considered

as having been a full-time student for one year, therefore not subject to the two-year legislation, regardless of the number of units that they transfer? In our case, 24 plus, etc. This is a junior-college student who has been in school for three years, but he's been a full-time student for only two years and has been working part-time and going as a part-time student for four semesters mixed in with two full-time terms. Are they countable for 25 percent of the degree requirements being completed when they come in after two terms as a full-time student?

Carol P. Powell (NCAA): We are looking at the terms of full-time enrollment.

Mr. Barkey: So that student would be entering his second year? Ms. Powell: If they have two full-time semesters, that's correct.

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): I have a question for clarification, even though it's a Division I issue. On Proposal No. 15-B where we talk about a minimum cumulative gradepoint average of 2.500 in Division I and in Division II, that's in bold

Mr. Ceddia: That's Division I only. Division II already is a 2.000. Mr. Carvajal: I understand that. The question I have is why is it in

bold type when there is no change?

Mr. Ceddia: It was a change in legislation to separate the two. As I understand it, that was the reason.

Mr. Walker: I'm speaking in favor of Proposal No. 19 and the loophole that it was intended to close. Mid-year transfer, for instance in the sport of football, comes in the spring. It can be 18 months before certification of satisfactory progress is effected. What this is designed to do is certify for satisfactory progress that following fall. I urge its

Mr. Ceddia: Thank you. Any other questions on Proposals 14 through 25? Let's look at Proposals 26 through 36. Proposal 28, I believe, has an interpretation.

Unidentified Delegate: I would like to go back to Proposal No. 28 just for clarification. That \$500, would you clarify that? Is that cumulative, is that per event? What does that mean?

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): That's an annual accummulation, per event.

Unidentified Delegate: So you could make a speaking engagement for \$495 25 times?

Mr. Fallis: That is correct. It's an institutional discretion.

Mr. Ceddia: There was much discussion on that at the Council. It was felt that some figure had to be struck. But that it would really be a matter of institutional discretion on how this would be handled.

Proposal No. 29. Just a reminder here. I know that a number of Division II institutions have one sport in Division I. For example, in our conference it's predominantly wrestling. I would remind those institutions that the Division I coaches certification goes into effect August 1 of 1992. So conferences or independent institutions might want to consult with the NCAA on what that implication is for your institution

_	1992	Convention	Proceedings	13 2

or conference and what process or procedure you would follow.

Proposal No. 30, there has been a move to reorder, I understand. Proposal No. 67 will be considered before No. 30. So are there any questions on Proposal 67, as well as Proposal 30 at this time? If Proposal 67 is adopted, Proposal 30 then will be moot.

Proposal 34 is the Division I-AAA football proposal. There were some comments earlier about that. There is an interpretation on that one as well.

William L. Price (Norfolk State University): I would like an interpretation on how the Council feels on Division I-AAA football and how the committee plans to vote on it.

Mr. Ceddia: When the Division I-AAA football initiative was undertaken as a result of action by a previous Convention, a committee was formed. Division II felt it was important that it be involved in that study. We asked and received permission to place a couple of consultants on that committee, and for the better part of a year, kept in very close touch with what was happening with the Division I-AAA study.

As a result of a number of recommendations from the steering committee, a lot of possible loopholes were closed in the Division I-AAĀ legislation. We heard from many members that there was a genuine concern that if Division I-AAA were to go into effect, we might see a stampede of some Division II institutions opting for Division I-AAA football and then moving other sports to Division I. Those loopholes have been closed as a result of the action by the Council. The Division II Steering Committee is in a position now to support Division I-AAA. football.

Mr. Price: One of the concerns that I and some members of my conference have is that Division III or I-AAA football will invade Division II, and in fact, that they would use it on a need basis in our recruiting. The same thing applies to Division I-AAA. Once the youngster is approached by Division I, he or she will not see this as a step down, but a step-up program. Division I will have the advantage. We feel that this is a tremendous disadvantage toward Division II as far + as recruiting.

Mr. Ceddia: We were advised of that position several times. We're' aware of that. We were not able to come up with any strategies to deal with that situation except to note that the feeling was based also on a 3 survey that we did for the membership. If we could close some of the loopholes, although this particular psychological and sociological aspect could not be dealt with, that in the recruiting process that, information could be shared with respect to athletes.

Richard H. Perry (University of California, Riverside): Speaking to Proposal No. 34, I'm very supportive of the Division I-AAA concept. I think it's very good for Division I. My concern is the manner in which these loopholes have been responded to. I take great exception to a rationale for structuring that this proposal will ensure that institutions classified in Divisions II or III will be unable to move their athletics program to Division I for the purpose of participating in the sharing of

Division I basketball funds. It seems to me that anyone who chooses to move from Division III or Division II to Division I does it singularly for that purpose. We've already seen the restriction of the eight-year rule for automatic qualification to make it difficult for Division II to move to Division I. Now we're seeing a restriction that says in the California area, where they are putting together a consortium of Division I schools to play Division I-AA or maybe I-AAA football, if a Division II or III member institution two years from now chose to move to Division I, it would be totally disenfranchised from any opportunity to join that conference if they were participating in Division I-AAA football.

It seems to me that the great American dream is that any kid can become president regardless of where you're from. God help you if your great American dream is to move from Division III to Division I or from Division II to Division I because someone is saying you can't do that and be a full functioning member even though you meet all the other criteria for membership. The fact that you come from Division II to Division I disenfranchises you. I think that's the power of politics at its

J. Robert Cockrum (Kentucky Wesleyan College): In the past nine years, Kentucky Wesleyan, a Division II member, has been playing on the Division III level because we can't see our way to funding scholarships. We're not particularly opposed to Division I-AAA. In fact, we do support it. But what it is effectively doing is moving us into a situation where we have some rather difficult decisions to make.

We will now be the only division that does not have a nonscholarship football option. We're frozen out of Division III starting with next year. After next year, Division I-AAA is not open to us. If we play Division II and don't have scholarships, we know exactly what's going to happen. There are very few schools in our area that we will be able to compete against in Division II. So this will effectively leave Division II as the only level without a nonscholarship option in football. I would like the Division II Steering Committee and the membership in general to consider some way that we could have this option left open to us. There are very few schools-I think right now only about 13-that fall into this problem. But it is a problem for us.

, Mr. Ceddia: I think you know this, but the Division II Steering Committee was aware of that dilemma. We did spend considerable time in trying to determine what might be appropriate alternatives. Because of the wide variance of scholarship aid in football, which was reinforced by the data you see in the survey, the best solution that we came up with was to leave Division II as it presently is structured in

Proposals 35 and 36 are resolutions sponsored by the Presidents Commission

Academics

Mr. Ceddia: We'll now move to Proposals 37 through 48, Academics and Eligibility. I'll ask Rich Johanningmeier to join me. We'll start with

_ 117

it roceedings : F. F. Di	vision II Business Sessior	
16 6 6 c	motitegg 2632101	
(2) P. (2)		

On Proposal 41, there is an amendment. There is an interpretation on your sheet, No. 7.

Proposal No. 45 is Division II. Proposal 45-1 has been ruled out of order, so that will not be considered.

Proposal 46 will become moot for Division II if Proposal 45 is adopted.

Financial Aid

Mr. Ceddia: We'll move to Proposals 62 through 75. Harold McGee will answer any questions.

Harold J. McGee (Jacksonville State University): There are materials for this particular grouping on your desks. There are no amendments-to-amendments. There are some proposals on your sheet-Nos. 65, 66, 68 and 69-that have interpretations you may wish to look at. It's been mentioned that Proposal 67 has been reordered. Proposal 67 will go before Proposal 30, and make Proposal 30 moot if it's adopted. Also, in your Official Notice there is a rewrite of Proposal No. 69. You may want to refer to those.

Playing and Practice Seasons

Mr. Ceddia: We'll move to Proposals 76 through 108, Playing and Practice Seasons. I'll ask Karen Miller to join me.

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): In this section, of the 35 proposals only eight of them pertain to Division II. There are interpretations regarding Proposal No. 88 and No. 94. Please take note.

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I would like to address Proposal No. 92. I realize there are only 25 or 30 institutions that are affected by this, but I would really appreciate any support that those institutions or any others might give to it. It's a field hockey proposal. It appears to expand the numbers and therefore fly in the face of the reform legislation. In effect, it does not. Field hockey, which unfortunately has become a very regional sport primarily in the eastern part of the country, has the unique position of being the only team sport covered by this legislation that has no dates provided in the nontraditional season. This legislation was drawn to make field hockey as parallel to soccer as possible. In many of our institutions, we have women's field hockey and men's soccer as the two counterpart sports. This legislation adopts the same language for field hockey as was adopted for soccer. It doesn't change the numbers for Divisions I or II dramatically. The place that it appears to is in Division III.

But what now has happened is we're under dates of competition for field hockey, which means if we play multiple events on a single day you count only one. Proposal 92 adopts the language "contests" so that the numbers appear to be greater. But by playing multiple events, you now must count every single event as one. So there is no expansion. Unfortunately, we addressed that to the presidents a little bit after the fact and haven't gotten their unitary support. But we have gotten support of many of them individually. I realize it doesn't apply to many of you if you don't have field hockey. Will this be addressed in a federated manner or will it be in the general session?

__ 1992 Convention Proceedings

Mr. Ceddia: Federated.

, Ms. Taylor: We'll address this later today or tomorrow morning. If you don't have the sport and you're inclined to vote against it, don't vote. If you would like to support it, we would be very happy to have

Mr. Ceddia: Sharon, having sat in the Presidents Commission meeting yesterday, there is some confusion as to whether or not this expands the schedules. When we vote on it this afternoon if you could reemphasize that, it might be helpful.

Ms. Taylor: I'll give you an example to show exactly how it does not. Thank you.

Mr. Ceddia: I don't know if there is any member of the Presidents Commission who would like to speak to this or not. But I think that the Presidents Commission did not support this yesterday in the final meeting before the Convention. Thank you.

Recruiting

Mr. Ceddia: To inform you about the possible mootness of some of these, Proposal 127 will be moot if Proposal 126 is adopted. There will be a probable motion to postpone Proposal 129 until the Division I Business Session. That doesn't affect us. Proposal 132, moot for Divisions I-A, I-AA, if No. 131-A is adopted. Proposal 134 will be moot for Division I-A if Proposal 133 is adopted. Just to keep your score cards up to date.

Enforcement, Championships, Committees

Mr. Ceddia: We'll move to the last grouping, Proposal Nos. 142 to \$153, which involve Enforcement, Championships and Committees. Marge Trout will be happy to respond to questions.

Deborah Chin (University of New Haven): I would like to speak for Proposal 153. The Division II committee, as well as I believe the Division III committee, does not support this proposal. We feel that at this time that the NAGWS Rules Committee is sufficient in meeting the needs of the college players. The group that sponsored this feels that the rules have not been sensitive to the collegiate game. The rules committee has had NCAA representation on it since the inception of the rules. We have three representatives at this time. The NCAA does have a very significant impact on the rules committee. We do not feel that another rules committee is necessary. We urge the defeat of this

· Marjorie A. Trout (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): I would like to call attention to Proposal No. 148. It looks as though the sponsors will withdraw it. Someone asked if we would move it. That's concerning Sunday championship competition. They are going to withdraw it because the executive director has the authority to waive this if two championships are being played on a Sunday at the same

General

Frank Cignetti (Indiana Universita esp
rrank Cignetti (Indiana University of Pennsylvania): I would like
an interpretation or some discussion on Proposal No. 71. I think there

Division II Business Session	

is some misunderstanding. Could somebody tell us how that will affect Division II? I think it's part of the total package of setting a minimum requirement for Division I, but also affects the equivalencies in Division II. Could someone interpret it?

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): I'm not sure anybody can interpret it. The proposal comes from the Big East Conference. It's being presented because of the Big East's concern about the Division I membership criteria requirements and the commitment to provide a certain amount of financial aid. This proposal addresses how athletics grant-in-aid should count in meeting the financial aid requirements for Division I. I'm not sure that in Division, II we really want to address it. If it is moved in Division II, I would urge opposition because it comes from a Division I conference that's concerned about the minimum financial aid requirements for Division I membership. Therefore, the steering committee believes it's really inappropriate for Division II.

Mr. Cignetti: If it does pass, how will it affect Division II in terms of countable financial aid and equivalency? Let's take for example our work-study job on campus. We've been recruiting a student-athlete who is not part of your grant-in-aid proposal. Does that enable him to take a work-study job on campus that doesn't count as public grant financial aid, but is part of his total package?

Mr. Fallis: If Proposal 71 passes without Amendment 71-1, then it essentially makes just the athletics grant-in-aid a countable aid.

Mr. Cignetti: That's my question.

Mr. Fallis: That's what will happen if Proposal 71 passes without the amendment. If Proposal 71-1 passes, and then 71 passes, the way I understand it, it doesn't change a thing. So it's really rather confusing It's the intention of the sponsors to withdraw Proposal 71-2.

Robert M. DeGregorio Jr. (Merrimack College): Could we have a clarification on what financial aid we're talking about in Proposal No. 68? Is that strictly athletics financial aid?

Mr. Ceddia: It's anything that's taken away from the athlete. Athletics aid or institutional aid. That's what I'm being told.

Mr. DeGregorio: Only aid that can be administered or given out by an institution?

Mr. Ceddia: That's right.

Mr. DeGregorio: No loans?

Mr. Ceddia: No. It's only institutional or administrative aid. Any other questions or thoughts on the legislation? Well, I think we did that?

REPORTS

The second secon

Championships Committee

Mr. Ceddia: We have a championships committee report to present to the membership. The chair of the committee, Jerry Hughes, a longtime member of the Council and former vice-president of Division II, unfortunately could not be with us this morning. I've asked another member of the championships committee who is finishing her term on

1992 Convention Proceedings

the Council as well as the championships committee to give the report. Please welcome Marjorie Trout to the microphone. She will present the championships committee report.

Marjorie A. Trout (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): As we

The Division II Championships Committee, which meets three times a year, is responsible for the review of the recommendations submitted by various Division II sports committees as they relate to the administration of championship programs. After its review of the sports committees' recommendations, the committee then analyzes these recommendations and forwards its report to the Executive Committee for final review. In addition, the championships committee administers the Division II enhancement fund that was made possible with the funds from the Association's television contract with CBS.

Division II championships participation information. A total of 4,651 student-athletes competed in NCAA Division II championships, compared to 4,417 during the previous year. The number of institutions sthat participated in championships decreased this year from 75.1 percent in 1989-90, to 67.3 percent, which can be attributed to the sincrease in Division II membership and the fact that these institutions were ineligible for NCAA championships. It is anticipated that this number will increase this coming year. After every meeting of the championships committee, the minutes of those meetings are reported to the NCAA so I'm not going to go into detail about our three meetings. But I would like to share with you areas relevant to the enhancement Flund, championships finances, bracket expansion, and the concept of regionalization for our championships.

The 1990-91 academic year marked the first year that funds were distributed from the Division II enhancement fund, which was made available from the 1991 to 1997 CBS television contract revenue. The funds were distributed to the membership last May and again will be distributed this spring. As a review, I would like to mention some of the pertinent facts regarding these funds. In Division II, the moneys have been divided into two areas. Fifty percent of the moneys are distributed equally to all Division II institutions that are eligible to receive the funds. In order to be eligible, those institutions must be members in good standing and also declare that they will participate in all NCAA championships. The remaining 50 percent of the fund is administered and distributed according to the number of units earned by institutions that have participated in the men's basketball championships. This money is distributed to the conferences. The conferences then distribute it to the individual schools. Or in some conferences, they have chosen to keep the moneys within their conference. I would like to remind you that in order to receive funds from both pools, the institution shall be active and eligible for championship competition and declare that it will participate in all NCAA championships. The committee may grant exceptions only if extenuating circumstances cause an institution not

Division II Business Session

to be able to comply with established policy.

I now would like to share some of the guidelines that were developed with regard to the basketball pool. If a conference disbands, its members shall retain their basketball shares. In the event that an institution leaves a conference and realigns with another, it becomes an independent and its original conference will remain in operation. The units that it earned remain with the conference that it left. During the committee meeting in December, the steering committee clarified what constitutes a conference. It was declared that if a conference falls below the six-member requirement, the basketball money will be retained by the conference for a one-year period. If the conference does not meet the six-member requirement at the end of one year, the moneys then are assigned to the institution that earned those units. If an institution reclassifies its membership to Division I or Division III. its basketball credits shall stay with the conference. If it is an independent, its credits are applied to the pool. If an independent joins a conference, it retains the units it earned as an independent before the date it elected to join the conference. Any units earned after that date accrue to the conference. No conference shall lose all of its units if it is represented in the tournament by an institution that later is declared ineligible, whereby the number of units would be reduced to one. If more than one institution represented the conference, the ineligible institution's units would be vacated.

Another area that I would like to share is the financing of champion-ships. During the August Executive Committee meeting, there was an elimination of the Division II championship reserve, which we all know as block grant or allocation. The championships now are a line-item budget. Before this action, Division II championships per diem and transportation funds were made available from excess receipts. Now these funds are included in the Association budget planning process.

During the 1990-91 championship season, \$2,418,328 was expended for championships transportation and \$1,286,875 was spent on per diem, for a total of \$3,705,203. During the 1989-90 championship season, transportation and per diem expenses amounted to \$2,373,975. It should be noted that the significant increase can in part be attributed to the increase in the per diem from \$26 to \$60 and the increases that were made in the official traveling parties of many of the championships. However, the significant increase in expenses is a concern of the committee. And the committee, in concert with both Divisions I and III. Championships Committees, directed the governing sports committees to exercise greater care when recommending championship sites, with particular consideration given to the transportation costs. The committee will scrutinize these recommendations more diligently in the future.

Another area I would like to speak to is the bracket expansion. The membership should be aware that the committee continues to receive several requests from sports committees for bracket expansion; however, only women's soccer was expanded from four to six teams.

The state of the s

Other requests that were received and denied this past year were: baseball, 24 to 28; men's soccer, 12 to 16, and women's volleyball, 20 to 24 teams. The committee's conservative nature has been prompted by the significant economic impact and the enhancements that were implemented this past year; for example, the \$60 per diem increase and the traveling party sizes. Transportation guarantees for all track championships also were initiated this past year.

During the past 10 years, the committee has studied the concept of regionalization as it relates to the selection of teams and playoff pairings for championship competition. As stated in the championship handbooks, Division II's philosophy is as follows: "Due to the limited amount of Division II interregional competition, and the comparative data between teams located in different regions, Division II sports committees shall make every effort to select teams for the championship participation on a regional basis, and to pair them on a regional basis, except when there are more than two teams from one conference."

In the past, governing sports committees that did not employ the regionalization concept were faced during the selection process with comparing teams in different regions of the country. And there was no head-to-head competition or common opponents to evaluate them. With the development of the regionalization concept, the championships that would provide for the evaluation of teams with comparative data. The governing sports committees have provided the championships committees with periodic reports as to how they were implementing the policy. In general, it was learned that most committees are adhering to the concept. In some cases, like men's basketball and football, the policy has been implemented in its purest sense. In these sports, an equal number of teams are selected from each of the established regions.

During this past December meeting, the concept was further clarified and the following position statement has been adopted: "Commencing with the 1993-94 championships, all governing sports committees for Division II championships in which teams are selected shall assign teams first by regions, either equally or by established criteria that should be considered, or by the number of participating institutions and the performance of these regional teams in previous championships. Such allocations shall be published in the respective championship handbooks."

The number of teams allocated to the region may be adjusted by the governing sports committee during the selection process if there is conclusive data permitting this. The inclusive data would refer to head-to-head competition or their common opponents. Again, I would like to note that this policy will pertain to all team championships and the individual-team championships of cross country, golf and tennis.

During the coming year, the committee will work closely with the various governing sports committees to implement the aforementioned regionalization plan. It is expected that there will be many questions, but the committee is of the opinion that the concept is sound and will

serve the best interests of our Division II institutions. Again, I would like to note that that statement will be included in the championship handbooks. And there are two basic components of it. One, all sports committees are to predetermine how many teams are to be selected in each region, either equally or by established criteria; and two, which is very important, there still exists flexibility to adjust the number of teams selected per region if the conclusive evidence of head-to-head competition or common opponents provides justification for such modification.

If you have any questions, I'm sure you can talk to committee members and Tony Ceddia.

Mr. Ceddia: Thank you, Marge. I woulld also like to thank Vic Buccola, who also is leaving the championships committee, for his good work. Those of you in the membership who have participated on that committee know that it's very demanding and in many cases a thankless task because you can't please everyone. Thank you for the report, Marge.

WAIVERS

[NOTE: The Division II business session heard petitions for waivers of Division II membership from the University of Central Arkansas, Drury College, Henderson State University, University of North Florida and Northwood Institute. The petitions were approved.

Student-Athlete Advisory Committee

Mr. Ceddia: Several years ago, the NCAA Council sponsored legislation to establish a Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Over the past year or two. I've had the opportunity to meet and talk with some of the members of the committee. Division II does have representation on that committee.

I have been asked by our representative, Mr. Thomas Burns, a student at Millersville University, if he could have a few minutes of the business session's time to address the body. Using the prerogative of the Chair. I have agreed to allow Tom to do this.

Tom is a student at Millersville University. He will be graduating this May. He is an honor student, an outstanding football player and is in the process of fighting the application battle to law school, where I'm sure he will be successful given his record.

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee member, Mr. Thomas Burns, to the microphone. (Applause.)

Thomas Burns (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): Thank you for allowing me to speak to the delegation this morning.

On behalf of my fellow committee members, I urge this delegation to support Resolution 124, which encourages each institution to create a Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, and Proposal No. 151, which calls for the expansion of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee from 16 to 28 members and will permit present committee members to

be reelected for one term. Both of these proposals would prove beneficial to the student-athletes and the NCAA.

A Student-Athlete Advisory Committee at each institution would create a solid network that will provide student-athletes with a better opportunity to have their experiences and ideas make an impact on the activities of the NCAA. It also would make our committee a more confident information resource for both the student-athletes and other committees of this Association. An increase in membership on our committee will provide us with new ideas and increased diversity of viewpoints while providing 300,000 student-athletes in this country with better representation. Allowing us to serve an additional term will give our committee needed stability and a chance to complete projects.

The NCAA is about us, the student-athletes. Let us assist you in the effort to make intercollegiate athletics the finest experience it can be.

Mr. Ceddia: He is as big in person as he was on the football field against Shippensburg. Thank you, Tom, for your comments.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

[NOTE: The slate for Division II representatives to the Council was approved as presented.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Core-Curriculum Requirements

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 14. [The motion was seconded.]

This probably is one of the simplest proposals before us in terms of understanding it. It simply increases from 11 to 13 the number of academic core courses a student must complete to establish initial eligibility. And it specifies that those two courses must be earned in English, math or natural or physical science. It is somewhat less than what the Knight Commission recommended, but it is we think a reasonable number. There was consultation with the appropriate organizations in the secondary schools.

We think that the record is fairly clear that the establishment of the initial 11 core courses has been very helpful in preparing our studentathletes for eligibility and, indeed, to all of our students coming to our college. We think this increase will be a positive step forward. It has been endorsed by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars. and Admissions Officers, ACT, SAT, the National Association of Collegiate Counselors and the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics. We would urge the approval of the proposal.

[Proposal No. 14 (Page A-11) was approved by Division II, 164-26,

Satisfactory Progress—Mid-Year Transfer Students

Olin B. Sansbury (University of South Carolina at Spartanburg): I move the adoption of Proposal 19. [The motion was seconded.]

124	 Convention	Proceedin,

This proposal will require all student-athletes who enter at mid-year to meet a prorated satisfactory-progress requirement as a condition of eligibility for the subsequent fall term. It's designed to close the serious loophole in the application of the Association's continuing-eligibility legislation. It affects student-athletes who first enter Division I or Division II institutions during the 1991-1992 academic year and thereafter. On behalf of the Presidents Commission and Council, I urge the adoption of Proposal No. 19.

[Proposal No. 19 (Page A-18) was approved by Division II, 186-4. roll-call vote.1

Satisfactory Progress—Regular Academic Year

Rodney C. Kelchner (Mansfield University of Pennsylvania): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will discourage the excessive use of summer school courses for eligibility purposes by limiting to 25 percent the proportion of satisfactory-progress hours that a student may earn during the summer. If this proposal is adopted, student-athletes no longer will be expected to be primarily athletes during their terms of competition with the expectation that they will make up for their lack of concentration on academics during the summer.

On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council, I: urge you to adopt Proposal No. 20.

Sandra Shuler (North Carolina Central University): In addition to the reasons cited, it is important to note the following: First, the proposal's effective date is August 1, 1992. This means that the proposal will affect only those credit hours earned by student-athletes during the 1992-93 academic year and thereafter will not be applied retroactively. Second, this proposal helps to address the concerns that the summer school enrollment often turns away from the campus at which the student-athlete is enrolled and may with some frequency involve academic work of less substance than the courses offered by the student-athlete's institution during the regular academic year.

In addition, I call your attention to a series of official interpretations that clarify how Proposal No. 20 will work. In particular, please note that the proposal establishes a minimum number of hours necessary to meet satisfactory-progress requirements. Student-athletes who exceed this minimum 75 percent requirement during the traditional academic year will continue to be able to advance the hours earned in excess of this minimum and apply those hours toward the 75 percent requirement. during the subsequent traditional term.

In addition, a student-athlete who receives an incomplete grade in a course taken during the traditional academic year may have that course credited toward the 75 percent minimum once it is completed even if it is not finished during the traditional academic year. These interpretations, as well as the amendment-to-amendment to establish a waiver of procedures to the 75 percent requirement, is sponsored by the Council. Proposal No. 20-1 will establish the fact that the imple-

mentation of Proposal No. 20 will be accompanied by a reasonable amount of common sense and flexibility.

In conclusion, the proposal does not prohibit student-athletes from enrolling in summer school courses to earn additional degree credit. It simply discourages the use of summer school as an academic term.

I encourage the adoption of Proposal No. 20.

Mr. Ceddia: For the benefit of the speaker and the earlier speakers who are supporting this motion, the Chair has been advised that there is an amendment-to-the-amendment. Parliamentary procedure requires that the amendment-to-amendment be acted upon before the amendment. Amendment-to-amendment 20-1 needs to be moved, seconded and acted upon before Proposal No. 20.

Mr. Kelchner: I would like to move amendment-to-amendment 20-1. [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Ceddia: The Chair is advised that this amendment-to-amendment provides a waiver procedure for Proposal No. 20. The waiver procedure has been recommended by the NCAA Council to deal with any extenuating circumstances that might develop if Proposal 20 were

Kenneth Rebman (California State University, Hayward): This is the amendment that I was assured was going to answer my concerns. But it doesn't seem to do so. I'm concerned about the impact of this amendment on schools that are year-round operations, which I think are increasing throughout the country. This waiver as I understand it allows waivers under individual circumstances but not for institutional circumstances. Would there be an interpretation that would permit an institution to have a regular summer program certified?

Mr. Ceddia: The Chair is advised that with this waiver provision that they would look at individual cases, but would have to be aware of the institution's operating calendar in dealing with those waivers. So I think it does address your concern.

Mr. Rebman: Under those circumstances, I'm willing to support this amendment and the ultimate amendment as well.

[Proposal No. 20-1 (Page A-20) was approved by Division II, 184-9, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

Richard Wettan [Queens College (New York)]: I think this is another case where we may have Division I legislation that may not be good legislation for Division II. We have many more walk-on students in Division II than in Division I, students who are taking light loads, trying to work and also be athletes. And we're trying to micromanage their academic careers. They may feel that it is good to take a heavy load one semester, a very light load in another semester and try to make up if they fall behind by taking summer school work. Who are we to decide that it's bad for students to balance their load by going through

I'm in favor of having 27 credits a year. Why are we now micromanaging and telling the students how they can accomplish that? I'm not sure we're being fair to them.

	·	-
126	1002 Comment on D	
	1992 Convention Proceedi	ıngs

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): This may be one of thoses issues where we were swept up by Division I. In the first place, these, proposals came from the Academic Requirements Committee, which Γ think has done one of the most effective jobs of research and development. of legislation and researching of alternatives of any committee that I can remember in a good many years.

We did consider these in the Division II segment of the Presidents Commission individually. And we felt that the requirement that 75 percent of the credit hours must be earned in the regular academic year is not a particularly burdensome requirement. And I look at it not so much in the negative-of keeping students out of summer school, classes—but rather on the positive side. That this would remind our student-athletes, and perhaps more importantly our coaches and others, that they are students. They shouldn't be disrupting their entire year. So we don't think it's particularly burdensome. We think it is important to protect the academic integrity of Division II. I urge that: we support it.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): For the information of the speaker who preceded Asa, keep in mind that a student may take more than six hours in the summer. That student can go to a double summer session, take six the first session and six the second session and have 12 hours. But the thing is, he or she may only count six of those toward continuing progress for athletics eligibility. But the student can still take 12 hours.

[Proposal No. 20 (Page A-19) was approved by Division II, 149-39, as amended by No. 20-1, roll-call vote.]

Satisfactory Progress—Fulfillment of Degree Requirements and Minimum Grade-Point Average

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 21-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, Proposal No. 21-A, together with the existing grade-point average requirement of Division II, is the cornerstone of the continuing. eligibility proposals recommended by the Academic Requirements Committee and sponsored by the Presidents Commission and Council.

I think this is particularly important because we all know how concerned those in athletics and the public have been about graduation rates. And grade-point alone certainly doesn't mean that a student is making progress toward graduation. This requirement would reassure everyone that we are serious about our students graduating. I strongly recommend passage of this.

Kendrick W. Walker (California Polytechnic State University, San? Luis Obispo): I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 21-A. The principle that this Association adopted last January provides for 25 percent of the student-athlete's curriculum to be completed before, entering the third year, 50 percent by the fourth year and 75 percent upon entering the fifth year.

Those of us concerned about graduation, keeping the student-

_____1992 Convention Proceedings .

athletes on track, should vote in favor of this. I urge its adoption.

J. Michael Jacobs (Shepherd College): Point of clarification. Is Proposal 21 in opposition to Proposal 24?

Mr. Ceddia: No, the Chair is advised that they are not in opposition to each other.

Mr. Jacobs: The concern I have in talking with my president, and speaking for him if I could at this time, is that as students matriculate, we all know from experience that they constantly change their majors. And as this goes on, it makes the accounting of Proposal 21-A pretty difficult. Proposal No. 24 is a lot simpler to deal with. That was my only

Mr. Ceddia: The Chair is advised that in Proposal 21 there is a waiver of procedure.

Bob V. Brennan [Wayne State University (Michigan)]: Philosophically, I would be tremendously for this; however, realistically, when you realize that you have over 300 athletes, and in our situation that's somewhere between 200 and 250 majors with varying requirements, ti's a paperwork circumstance. We almost have to hire a new person to handle the paperwork for this.

Unidentified Delegate: I would echo that. This is very applaudable but it takes a lot of paperwork and staff time to implement this. It is going to be tremendous on our staffs and increase costs.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): On the fulfillment of a degree or a specific baccalaureate program, when we speak of 25 percent we're not talking specifically about a student's major. We are talking about the degree requirements, per se, could be general requirements, etc., elective units that are authorized by various majors. Is that correct?

Mr. Ceddia: That's the interpretation the Chair is under.

Mr. Barkey: We did have another response at the beginning of this. The calculation, in getting into percentages, we're all philosophically very much in favor of this. Look at our CSU campus system in California. With 120 hours or units to graduate, 25 percent only represents 30 units. We are involved with a great number of junior college transfers who come in after one or two years. And even the twoyear transfer may not be, and in fact in many cases is nowhere close to having 30 units at that point that they transfer to the member institution after two years of junior college.

That, and the workload that's going to be increased, is exactly what we talked about an hour ago. Now the calculation of percentages on top of everything else and the use of personnel to do this is monstrous. I don't think we have to have this in Division II. And that's just what we have been talking about for the last 24 hours.

While we philsophically want this, I ask Division II representatives, please think about this and start some kind of action that's going to cut down on the paperwork that we're absolutely overwhelmed with now.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): This proposal has a lot of philosophical support, but a lot of practical concerns. It will put some

Division II Business Session .	
	 129

burden on our campuses. If our student records are computerized, as they are on most of our campuses, it ought not to be an intolerable burden.

But if we are going to have academic standards, if the concept of the student-athlete is going to mean something, at some point we have to draw the line and be willing to pay the piper. I think the benefits we will a gain in terms of our commitment to the young men and women who come to our campuses on scholarships to compete in athletics and the benefits we will serve in maintaining this kind of program by far outweigh the cost. I say that as a president who is struggling with. budget cuts, as are most of our institution representatives.

I think the benefits so far outweigh the cost that we ought to vote on.

our philosophical convictions..

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): I would like a clarification. There seems to be some ambiguity in our part of the room. Perhaps clarification has been given and we missed it. But a concern that's been expressed relates to Page 19 under Bylaw 14.5.2.1 concerning the adjective "specific" in defining degree program.

Are we talking about any hours that lead to graduation? Or are we talking about hours in mechanical engineering as opposed to computer science? So if the student transfers from mechanical to computer science, do we calculate all hours toward the degree or just in the

major? That's some ambiguity that's been bothering people.

Mr. Ceddia: I believe the interpretations that have been circulated address that question. Page 3. "The Council affirms that NCAA Academic Requirements Committee interpretation that the cumulative minimum grade-point average required for graduation is based upon the institution's overall grade-point average required for graduation for purposes of meeting the requirements of this legislation."

"C" further amplifies that. "If a student-athlete is enrolled in a: degree program that has a specific grade-point average requirement, it may be necessary to meet that requirement in determining whether the student-athlete is considered to be in good academic standing at the institution."

It doesn't really address it.

Mr. Walker: To address that concern, I think the intent of the proposal is for all units that count toward graduation, not just those units in the history major that are history courses; but those courses that are general education courses, 25 percent of that total, leads toward graduation.

And if I may speak to the junior college issue that was alluded to earlier. We have as an Association said something very clear to high schools-which is core curriculum. We have increased that core curriculum from 11 to 13 today. What this says to junior colleges is prepare your students for the academic work they are going to be doing at our institutions. All of us know of some of those tragedies that come to our places from junior colleges who are ill-prepared. What we are saying to junior colleges is prepare them. It's their responsibility. And

we're reminding them to do that.

Rev. Kevin G. O'Connell (Le Moyne College): I used to be a department chairman. And I read this proposal in terms of satisfying departmental requirements for a major, which is extremely difficult for registrars to stay on top of in institutions that are not highly computer-

.... I spent six frustrating years with a very small department trying to get the institution, rather than myself, to keep on top of satisfactoryprogress toward completion of degree requirements with majors in my

s. Although I didn't think this through before coming here, I initially indicated support for this resolution. I think the questions that have been raised of both ambiguities and the degree of difficulty in keeping track of satisfactory progress toward a major in regard to certifying them each year lead me to oppose this proposal until perhaps we clarify a little better how it applies and how it's to be attested to each year. Then I might conceivably support it. At the same time, I think Proposal No. 24, which talks about progress on the overall standards, tightens our requirements further. I would urge that maybe at this time we not support this proposal.

John Yarnali (Humboldt State University): If a student has more than one major, how are you going to count this? Are we going to have a priority major?

The way around this for a student who is having some difficulty is simply to declare several academic majors. And my suggestion is that this is going to be a proposal which, if people decide to follow it, they will follow it. If they decide they want to circumvent it, it can be circumvented with great ease. And I want to suggest to you that that makes it a bad piece of legislation. I would urge that the Convention not adopt it.

Mr. Sansbury: This proposal was designed to address a very serious criticism of intercollegiate athletics; and that is that we allow students to use up their eligibility without making progress toward earning a degree. I don't see why it's so confusing. It says specifically that you are trying to ensure that they earn credits in a degree program. That involves more than just the courses in the major. It involves the general education requirements.

There may be some particular needs that have to be addressed on an individual basis for students who have changed a major or for a doublemajor concept, although I don't think it should be that difficult. The legislation provides a waiver procedure for those special cases.

So I see no reason for this session not to act on this legislation.

Mr. Barkey: I don't know what the previous speaker means; that we're criticized because we're not making progress toward graduation. We have legislation in place that requires a minimum of 12 academic units or hours per term that lead directly to the undergraduate degree. General students don't have that. We have that in place now. So percentages are almost moot. We're requiring that they make progress right now. And most of them take much more than 24 hours, as we all

130 1992 Convention	Proceeding
---------------------	------------

know. Why do we need to go to this percentage business on top of our current legislation?

Joseph B. Oxendine (Pembroke State University): I would like to support this proposal. But Mr. Chair, I would like you to speak with authority, if you can, that we are talking about percentages toward 122 hours to graduate or percentages toward 128 hours.

I think it's unfortunate if that's what we mean. It is unfortunate to use the term "student-specific degree program." Can you speak with authority that we are talking about total hours toward graduation, namely 122 or 128? If we're talking about degree requirements in terms of mechanical engineering or whatever, we do have a serious problem.

Mr. Ceddia: I think the Chair is willing to speak with great ambiguity on this matter. (Laughter)

For example, at my institution if a student were a biology major, that program requires 132 credits. Those are specific credits required for a degree in biology. Included within the corpus of that 132 credits is the core curriculum of 48 hours of general education. Those courses would be interpreted as being courses specifically geared toward the student's completion of his or her 132 credits.

If the student were not in a major field, i.e., in an undeclared category, then those courses would be counted toward graduation but not in a specific program. And only when that student were to be admitted into a specific degree program would those courses then be considered specific to that degree program.

That's the best I can do. I think that was the intent of the proposal? Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): Reviewing our survey, look at the bottom of the first page. The respondents were in agreement, 82.1 answered in the affirmative, that new legislation in Division II has resulted in an unrealistic administrative burden for the institutions' staffs.

As one of those 82 percent who is not agreeing with this, I refer to the first item where it says, "Of the 134 respondents, 72.4 percent agreed that the current Division II rules governing continuing eligibility are sufficient for assuring that Division II student-athletes are making satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate degree."

I often think that for those who are in the trenches, who are actually doing the work and being accountable for those kind of things, we need to get back to that principle of keeping it simple and keeping it honest and moving it forward. I think we have it on the books. We have a great satisfactory-progress effort. I would like to see us continue to maintain that without additional changes in our current rules.

[Proposal No. 21-A (Page A-20) was defeated by Division II, 57-134, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

[The meeting was recessed for lunch.]

Wednesday Afternoon, January 8, 1992

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with Mr. Ceddia presiding.

132 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Ceddia: I would ask the delegates to please take their seats.

Before we begin voting on the issues remaining on the agenda, the
Chair has gotten a request from a member of the NCAA Council
representing Division I-AAA, Elaine Dreidame, the senior associate
director of athletics at the University of Dayton. She would like to
address the membership on the Division I-AAA football matter. She
also chaired the Council Subcommittee to Develop a Division I-AAA
Football Classification.

R. Elaine Dreidame (University of Dayton): I would like to thank President Ceddia and the Division II delegates for the opportunity to help clarify some of the issues about the Division I-AAA football proposal.

As we review Proposal No. 34, it is important to remind ourselves of the significant reform measures that were passed in the 1991 Convention and of the many factors that made this reform a reality. The Division I-AAA football legislation will provide a classic occasion for the Division I nonscholarship football programs, which will be displaced as a result of the elimination of all the division classifications, and will complete the 1991 reform package. This legislative concept significantly assisted Division III and was important to the give-and-take process that resulted in a number of legislative victories at the 1991 Convention.

We must remember that Division I-AAA football as proposed is costcontainment legislation. And the universities that supported the
felimination of multidivision classification, even though it eliminated
them from NCAA championship competition, were dependent upon the
good faith and trust of colleagues with regard to their support of the
Division I-AAA football legislation before you. The 1991 Convention by
resolution charges the subcommittee to develop legislation to establish
a Division I-AAA football classification. And the committee worked to
present legislation that would provide a place for the 3,000 studentathletes involved in programs currently used in multidivision classification and at the same time create the least disruption possible to other
segments of the membership. We worked for more than a year
massaging the proposal to do just this and in fact had two special
meetings in June specifically to work out the Division II concerns.

The legislation that's proposed has minimal impact on Division II. It takes absolutely nothing away from the current Division II options of membership movement upward, Division I-A, Division I-AA or Division I-AAA. But the proposed bylaw, which requires an institution to be a member of Division I as of September 1, 1991, in order to be eligible to participate in Division I-AAA football, prevents Division II institutions from being able to use I-AAA football as a vehicle to get to Division I. This language was put in at the specific request of your elected Council and Presidents Commission representatives with the good faith understanding that Division II leadership would urge passage of the legislation so that the merits of Division I-AAA football could be determined by the Division I delegates since the legislation does not

ivision II Business Session	122
-----------------------------	-----

have any significant impact upon Division II.

If the Division I-AAA legislation were defeated, there are two factors that could negatively impact Division II. First, those schools that would be forced to try to operate the nonscholarship football programs in Division I-AA would be encouraged in Division II to remain in their own geographical areas and to move to Division I to help fill out their football schedules. As the Division III institutions have indicated, they will be apprehensive about continuing to play Division I nonscholarship football schools if their financial aid regulations are not governed by the NCAA.

And secondly, 25 cost-containment votes thrown into the current mix of Division I-AA institutions will be enough to tip the delegate balance downward. And within a very short time, the Division I-AA scholarship maximums and spring practice regulations could almost mirror?

Again, there would be no protection clause to keep the top Division II. programs from moving to Division I-AA. In either instance, Division II. I-AA gains members, and thereby championship slots, and Division II loses members, and thereby championship slots. However, passage of Division I-AAA football legislation will assure that this will not occur.

The Council and Presidents Commission have both cosponsored this legislation. And on behalf of the subcommittee, I would urge your support.

Richard H. Perry (University of California, Riverside): You say that this is not to negate the opportunity for Division II programs to lose to Division I. I would submit that the first question almost anybody-asks in moving from one division to another is: "What are the opportunities for conference affiliation?" If the only conference affiliation available to you a year from now would be a Division I-AAA football conference you are virtually disenfranchised from that movement because you can't be a full functioning member.

It seems to me that control of movement from a division should be based on meaningful financial and programmatic criteria that allows us to meet those criteria. If you do, then you come in as a full player. These kinds of artificial cost containments are outside the process, it seems to me, by a long ways.

Ms. Dreidame: If there were enough Division I-AAA schools geographically located in clusters where they could form these referred-to conferences, we would not have the need for the Division I-AAA legislation. However, other than the East coast, they are scattered throughout the country. And they need to be able to play the Division III schools. The only way they can do this is to be governed by the same NCAA financial aid regulations. And that is the main thrust of why we feel we need Division I-AAA legislation.

William L. Price (Norfolk State University): I have a concern about this because of recruitment. As you well know, those schools that are going to Division I-AAA would have a large amount of facilities over Division II. And many young people will be impressed by playing in a

Division I program over Division II. Many of our Division II programs also use a need basis for recruiting. Very few of us have the necessary funds to recruit fully, say a full football scholarship, so we have to go on a need basis.

With that in mind, the Division I-AAA people will go to our pool of athletes, they will recruit them on the basis of facilities and equipment and being a Division I program.

Ms. Dreidame: Just to speak for those schools that are currently using multidivision classification and playing in Division III, I know from talking with the various coaches that we are not recruiting against the Division II schools. We're recruiting basically against the Division III schools.

And we will have even less of an advantage in recruiting because we will now no longer have a championship that we will be eligible for. It will simply be a 10-game season schedule. And we will not be recruiting against any scholarship program.

Mr. Price: Mr. Chair, I'm going to get real personal. We are located in Norfolk, Virginia. We're a multidivision university applying to Division I-AAA. We use the same facilities. Can you imagine me trying to recruit a young man or young lady to Norfolk, where we use Old Dominion's football field? And we can tell a student to come to Old Dominion and play in Division I football. That's the problem I think we're going to have.

Ms. Dreidame: Simply a question. You can offer them a scholarship. Whether it be minimal or not, you can offer them academic aid. You can preferentially package the financial aid. Under Division III regulations, you cannot influence their financial aid at all. They simply have the same need-based aid based on the same criteria as any other student at your institution.

Mr. Price: You don't have to give scholarships because you're Division I-AAA or I-AA. There are many Division II schools that are lacking scholarships at this moment. So I can't see the need for another division. Sooner or later there are going to be four and five. We're the only division that people are really pushing us out. And now Division I. Sooner or later there will be no Division II.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Annual Coaches Certification—Division II

Margaret R. Preska (Mankato State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 29.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation would require that a Division II coach be certified annually before contacting or evaluating prospects off campus. That certification will include a standardized national test demonstrating the coach's knowledge of NCAA recruiting rules. It's important to take this responsible step to ensure that the coach knows the rules governing recruiting. It's important to note that the Division I membership adopted this rule last year. It will become effective for Division I coaches August 1, 1992.

134	 1992	Convention	Proceeding
	 1992	Convention.	Proceedin

The national office will be developing a certification program to be implemented. The Council will have the opportunity to review and monitor the development of the program.

If this proposal is adopted, the Division II Steering Committee's intends to assure that a certification program developed for Division II coaches does not mirror the Division I program. It will be modified to fit Division II needs. It may be argued that the spirit of recruiting and the inherent problems are different on the Division I level than on the Division II level and therefore there is greater need for a certification; program in Division I.

However, it also can be argued that knowledge of recruiting rules should not be a problem for Division I coaches. The size of the athletics department staff of Division I member institutions allows them the opportunity to set up programs through which they educate coaches on NCAA rules and regulations. Division II institutions also employ many more coaches who are part-time. And it is harder to assure that those coaches are familiar with NCAA rules and regulations. So this proposal will help assure that all Division II coaches are taking the time to familiarize themselves with our NCAA rules.

On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I urge the adoption of Proposal No. 29 to assure each Division II member institution that our coaches have sufficient understanding of NCAA rules before they are permitted to recruit off campus and to assure that all Division II member institutions are on a level playing field in applying those rules.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): I'm going to speak in opposition to this. And I hope I don't have to get up and do this very often. But here we go again. Immediately under "intent," it says "similar to the certification program established in Division I." That's scary right away. Even though we have comments that it's going to be modified. She is very accurate in saying that there are part-time coaches in Division Il. I know many people in this room who have a very solid program for their coaching staff that don't have that in their institutional responsibilities.

Now we have a national governing body saying it is going to certify our coaches to recruit. That's an insult to the intelligence of this group. You're telling these very competent people they cannot properly educate their coaches, they are irresponsible in pointing out their responsibilities for off-campus recruiting. And that is not fact. We do have seminars. We do instruct our coaching staffs. They go through the Manual. They are particularly geared to the recruiting section.

I don't think we have to get involved in forcing them to take a test out of the national office and doing the paperwork and preparation that's going to be required for your coaching staff to be certified. They are professional people. I think we could do this at institutions and at a local-administration level. Let's please take a look at this before we get carried away with being like Division I again.

[Proposal No. 29 (Page A-33) was approved by Division II, 142-55,

roll-call vote.

Financial Aid—Summer School

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, I think it's a good idea to do all we can to help our studentathletes succeed in college life. And I think that a head start for this kind of assistance is legitimate. It's certainly not detrimental to practice. It is useful to the individual athlete.

J. Michael Jacobs (Shepherd College): I'm going to speak against this. And the reason is, we're looking at cost containment. At my minstitution, I personally cannot afford to pay for a young man or young lady who is coming to my institution and has to go to summer school. At the same time, we are looking for a level playing field. I think those who can will unbalance the playing field to their advantage.

 $^{23}\mathrm{H}$ think it's another one of those recruiting things where one person says, "Well, I'll pay you to go to summer school." And we all know while going to summer school they could be working football or basketball in a situation like that.

So I'm against this because I think it just further unevens the playing field and at the same time creates a dichotomy between different levels. [Proposal No. 67 (Page A-95) was defeated by Division II, 50-145, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

Summer Financial Aid—Incoming Student-Athletes

Mr. Lubbers: Mr. Chair, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 30 for the same reasons I moved Proposal 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 30 (Page A-34) was defeated by Division II, 59-135, two abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Full-Time Enrollment—Final Semester/Quarter

Robert A. Oliver (University of Northern Colorado): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

Under current legislation, a student-athlete may be enrolled in less than a full-time program of studies during the final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate degree provided the student is taking the courses necessary to complete his or her degree. Currently, the student-athlete who utilizes this exception to the full-time enrollment requirement forfeits all future eligibility.

Proposal No. 38, if adopted, would say that such a student-athlete does not forfeit all future eligibility provided he or she completes all the degree requirements during that final term and is eligible to receive a degree upon the next degree-granting date.

In keeping with the spirit of academic reform and the increased emphasis that is being placed on the importance of student-athletes obtaining a degree, I urge you to adopt this proposal. It rewards those student-athletes who actually do receive a degree earlier than other student-athletes.

1000 -	~ h .
1992 Convention Proceedings	a. fekt
Contention 1 Tocecutings	3 124

Rev. Kevin G. O'Connell (Le Moyne College): I have a question about the interpretation of the proposed amendment. As I read it, the current text near the end of the bylaw says the student will be eligible "provided the student has not exhausted the five years or 10 semesters for completion of the student's four seasons of eligibility," he can keep playing. "Thereafter," which I interpret to mean after 10 semesters or five years have been completed, "the student shall forfeit eligibility in all sports, unless" we have another semester or quarter running. Would this deal with a student on 11th semester, who wished to play his four vears?

Mr. Ceddia: No.

Rev. O'Connell: I will submit the language is extraordinarily ambiguous not to mean that.

Mr. Ceddia: The 10-semester rule is still intact.

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): The situation here. is if you have an extraordinary student who is in his third season of competition and doesn't manage to graduate but fills his degree requirements. Under present legislation, they forfeit all other eligibility. Even though they may come back to the institution for a fourth year and start their master's program, they will not be eligible.

This permits them to compete in that first year of their master's program and complete their fourth year. It's not an extension of the

terms or the semesters.

Richard H. Perry (University of California, Riverside): Inasmuch, as this language specifies that the student-athlete may compete whileenrolled in less than a full-time course of study, does this preclude a student-athlete who exercises the option of taking graduate-course work during that same period?

Mr. Ceddia: No, the Chair is advised it does not.

[Proposal No. 38 (Page A-61) was adopted by Division II.]

Outside Competition—Division II

Daniel G. Guerrero (California State University, Dominguez Hills): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 45.

[The motion was seconded.]

At last year's Convention under the umbrella of academic reform, the membership voted favorably on a number of proposals. None was more significant than the major playing and practice season proposal, which incorporated a packet of components—I believe it was something like A through L-that certainly brought a new realm of administrative concerns to our individual programs. And certainly brought to the forefront our need to enhance compliance capabilities.

Included in this proposal last year was the elimination of the opportunities for student-athletes to compete outside of the traditional playing season. We're now beginning to see the implications of this legislation. In sports such as women's and men's soccer and women's volleyball, student-athletes, after completing a 21/2- to three-month season, now are faced with the reality that they won't be able to play competitively in their sports until May or June, or at least until the

______1992 Convention Proceedings

academic year is over; unless for example in institutions that sponsor nontraditional spring soccer.

Many institutions that have chosen not to sponsor nontraditional spring soccer are feeling the need at this time to do so. And they now are incurring costs that they had never before realized. As a result of that, the passage of last year's legislation really dealt with issues of cost that in some measure were perhaps counterproductive to the cost-containment issues that we so strongly advocate.

Relative to the issue of academic concerns, I believe that we wholeheartedly support many of the reforms. It's evident today that we are doing that. Just as we did last year. When you look at women's and men's soccer and women's volleyball players, it is my understanding that these particular sports and these student-athletes are not what you might consider "average students." Yet those individuals are really feeling the brunt of this legislation. As in years past, a lot of legislation will be brought before this body that addresses problems and concerns of Division I institutions; and not necessarily affect Division II

I once again urge this body to utilize its autonomy to vote for legislation that will benefit student-athletes and deal with today's issues of over-legislation; and to vote for Proposal No. 45, which will allow student-athletes to compete in outside competition after their playing seasons.

i Mr. Ceddia: Just for the benefit of the membership, again, Proposal No. 45-1 has been ruled out of order by the Parliamentarian of the

. Robert E. Hartwell (Adelphi University): I would like a ruling on Proposal No. 46. What does that do if it's passed?

Mr. Ceddia: If Proposal No. 45 passes, the Chair has been advised that Proposal 46 is most to Division II.

Marjorie A. Trout (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): I rise on behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council in opposition to Proposal No. 45.

Last year we adopted legislation intended to reduce the overall time demands on student-athletes. Adoption of this proposal will remove the limitations on the number of contests a student-athlete may participate in by permitting a student-athlete to participate in noncollegiate competition during the academic year. If this legislation is adopted, it will encourage the formation of outside teams. And NCAA member institutions would have no control over the time demands made by outside teams on their student-athletes.

Lawrence E. Fitzgerald (Southern Connecticut State University): I supported this proposal for some of the reasons you've already heard. But let's keep in mind that soccer is not one of the sports that we have in mind with the reduction. According to the information we received this morning, men's soccer offers an average of 4.7 equivalency, when we have 10 possible, and women's, 3.15, when we have 11 possible.

This sport deserves our support. It's one that we need our kids

involved with on an organized basis. We're just not doing enough of that during our regular season. Let's give them an opportunity to play outside NCAA competition. Let's open up those opportunities. I ask your support.

Kenneth Rebman (California State University, Hayward): I strongly support this proposal. If the intent of your existing legislation is to prevent athletics departments and institutions from putting undue pressure on their students to participate during the off-season, then that's what we ought to prohibit.

If we don't believe that as administrators or coaches we can follow through and do the right thing, it doesn't seem to me that the answer would be to limit private rights of individual students. I consider it unconscionable to deny students the right to participate in sports that they love on their own time.

Keith R. Phillips (Seattle Pacific University): I too would like to ask the support of the Division II membership of this legislation. As mentioned, a significant cost-reduction factor has been built into this legislation. If we are forced to provide programs in the nontraditional segment, that will be a very costly item. It also extends the coaching season and the practice periods in a way that may become very extensive.

Secondly, it puts us at a definite recruiting disadvantage with institutions that are not members of our Association. Those students in soccer and volleyball will know that they can continue to develop their skills and play their sport. They will therefore choose institutions where they have opportunities that we do not provide them.

[Proposal No. 45 (Page A-74) was defeated by Division II, 97-101, one abstention, roll-call vote; motion to reconsider defeated, 86-102, two abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Outside Competition

Robert E. Hartwell (Adelphi University): I move Proposal No. 46. [The motion was seconded.]

We just heard the arguments of Proposal 45. I think that they bear the same arguments as Proposal 46. I would point out that as an institution that has not sponsored a nontraditional season in soccer, in looking into it there is a great deal of expense and student-athletes' time involved in this.

Also, many institutions have the opportunity to have their students play in outside competition. And we have a number of NCAA regulations in place to take care of those procedures. So I would urge our membership to support Proposal 46.

Marjorie A. Trout (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I urge the defeat of Proposal No. 46.

Proposal No. 46 erodes the legislation that was adopted last year by allowing student-athletes at institutions that do not sponsor nontraditional seasons in their sport to participate in outside teams during the academic year outside the season. Last year's legislation, which does

140 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

not allow student-athletes to compete on outside teams during the academic year outside the season, was an attempt to alleviate the time demands that are placed on student-athletes to compete on outside teams during the academic year and give student-athletes more time to spend on their academic work.

Let's not stop protecting student-athletes by adopting this legislation.

Terry Wanless (University of North Dakota): I rise in opposition to this, but more from a perspective of two issues.

One, I have a concern about student-athletes engaging in outside competition. If they are grant-in-aid student-athletes and are injured, which I think is highly probable in these events, does the institution maintain responsibility in that respect?

And, two, I'm concerned about Section B of Proposal 46 in terms of the responsibilities of monitoring the number of weeks that student-athletes can participate in this kind of activity. And here we are expected as an institution to monitor the number of weeks on an outside activity that we have no control over. So it's a real problem for us, an unsurmountable problem. And I urge you to vote against it. It's bad legislation.

Keith R. Phillips (Seattle Pacific University): For the same reasons we urged you to consider Proposal 45, we urge the adoption of Proposal 46.

In addition to that, this does have safeguards that would preclude some of the concerns that have been expressed by the Presidents Commission. It provides the same basis and same footing without forcing institutions that do not wish to invest the money, the time and the energy into the nontraditional segment to do so. I urge your support for this kind of legislation.

Thomas J. Kearns (Northern Kentucky University): I support this proposal. My president supports this proposal. And he does not lightly oppose the Presidents Commission. But fairness dictates that we remedy this situation.

There is no legislation that this body has passed in the last 10 years that's more visibly dangerous to athletes on my team. In soccer, they feel as though they are being punished. They feel it's an intrusion into their lives. They are being asked to give up for six months something that's critically important to them.

This can have a major impact on their academic performance. Most of these student-athletes are more concerned about how they are going to relieve the stress of giving up something that's dear to them for six months.

I urge your opposition to this proposal.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): Is there any basic difference between Proposal 45 and Proposal 46?

Mr. Ceddia: The Chair is advised that there is a difference in Section B.

Mr. Barkey: In reference to 22 weeks?

Carol P. Powell (NCAA): Proposal 45 allows you to play on an

Division II Business Session14	Division	II Business Ses	ssion	14
--------------------------------	----------	-----------------	-------	----

outside team during the academic year once your institution's playing, season is over. That's the way the rule was before last year.

Proposal 46 would allow student-athletes at schools that did not sponsor a nontraditional season to play on outside teams. There is a limit as to how many can play on an outside team. And there is still a total week limit on how long a student-athlete can be on a collegiate team and an outside team.

Mr. Barkey: I see. Then monitoring the weeks and hours per week, etc., does pertain to Proposal 46?

Mr. Ceddia: Only to Proposal 46.

Mr. Barkey: I agree with the previous speaker and support this motion despite B, which unfortunately is in there.

There is a real problem in institutions that choose not to sponsor a nontraditional segment. Their problem is telling a female volleyballaplayer on November 10 that it does not sponsor volleyball as a nontraditional season, therefore you're done until next June. At institutions sponsoring nontraditional seasons, athletes participate in outside competition as a member of that institution's team.

This is a very serious problem. We have to sponsor nontraditional segments. But we do not need to spend institutional resources to fund those activities in a nontraditional season. Teams can raise their own money for the nontraditional season. But institutions that are going to have to pay the cost are not going to do it. That's a terrible problem. It's very difficult to tell athletes they're through for the year November 10 because unlike the state university we're not sponsoring a nontraditional season.

That is very unfair to student-athletes. And quite frankly it is commonly known in this room that Division II student-athletes did not respond the same way that Division I athletes did in that survey. And they are going to be upset about this restriction on out-of-season play. They can't go out and play USVBA volleyball. They can't go out and play on a Sunday soccer league. This is not fair to these athletes.

Mr. Phillips: Picking up on what Robert pointed out, I support the notion that the only opportunities that these athletes have for development of their skills is during this particular time frame. Volleyball is played in the winter and spring. Soccer is played in the winter and spring. There are no other off-season opportunities. It is not played in the summer, as are many other sports.

So we really are denying these student-athletes their due privileges in a very negative way.

[Proposal No. 46 (Page A-75) was defeated by Division II, 92-104, three abstentions, roll-call vote; motion to reconsider was defeated.]

Maximum Awards — Division II

Joanne Kuhn (Texas Woman's University): I move on behalf of the Lone Star Conference the adoption of Proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

I went to the general session yesterday with the intention of day-

142 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings ¹

dreaming. I was going to spend my time working on my remarks for today. But when Dick Schultz started speaking, a small portion of my job was done. He talked about budget freezes. He talked about budget cuts. He talked about the condition of the United States. I'm not going to repeat that. But he did mention that each of us has the responsibility as members of an athletics department to do what we can.

So first of all, I speak to those of you who are at high equivalencies, who have 40 football scholarships and 12 basketball scholarships. And I ask you to consider this: Is your university in good enough shape that you can keep those limits? If not, you should support Proposal No. 64.

I was going to share my comments on the CEO survey. Everybody else is doing my job because this morning the survey was shared with you. And it became quite clear that the means of equivalencies in the United States is well under the current limits and would in fact be well under the proposals that we have put forward. And best of all, women's basketball limit is 12, the equivalency is 7.3; football is 40, the mean is would help that.

that Division I is in here, but I'm going to read it anyway: "A member of Division II believes in permitting athletically related financial aid for Student-athletes, but on a more modest basis than that permitted in Division I."

In 1993, without our proposal 14 of the 30 sports, almost 50 percent, will have more scholarships available to Division II institutions than to Division I. Another seven will have one or less difference. We have 21 out of 30. Is that at a more modest level? Our proposal excluded women's volleyball, women's gymnastics and women's tennis, as did the proposal last year because part of our intent was to maintain a

I do not oppose further study, as was mentioned this morning. I do not oppose further surveys. But unless the Publishers Clearing House representative is coming to our campuses sooner than I think, we must do something now. I would like to have them propose additional financial aid for our student-athletes. And I would like to propose more sports for Division II. And I would like to propose a wonderful plan, which I'm sure I could come up with some day, that would do something for the gender inequity that is created by the simple fact that you need more people to play football. So we do have to address this.

But until the fairy godperson comes along, this is a small step. It is the right step. And if we don't like it, we can do something better next year. I request your support of Proposal 64.

Harold J. McGee (Jacksonville State University): I rise in opposition to the proposal. Modest 1s not the same thing as meager. We're talking about proportionality here.

If you want cost containment, there are lots of ways to contain costs. Don't involve students' lives. I live near the Southern Appalachians. Financial aid is very important in attracting students to higher

Division II Business Session

education. Athletics programs do that. If you don't like athletics financial aid, Division III is an option. Division II provides it. It's a possibility for funding. It's very important in recruiting students. It's very important in their success.

I'm very concerned that there are ways to contain costs that we are not using. There are many options, as the survey indicated, that could be taken. The statement in the proposal about how close we are to Division I in all sports does not work for football. In terms of fielding a

squad, it's a very difficult cut in that respect.

Most of you receive a magazine, such as Athletic Administration, News Slick or Pulp Piece telling you what to buy and use. I'm struck by an ad in there by Division III schools that shows their fiscal plan and its cost. I read in the Los Angeles Times that a public relations firm announced that it will be handling publicity for a university's men's volleyball team. There is lots of money being inappropriately spent in athletics. But I don't think scholarships is the way to make those cuts. I ask that we not support the proposal.

Noel W. Olson (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference):

I oppose this measure for some of the same reasons.

But before I go into that, I would like to commend the steering committee for conducting the survey. I only hope that the membership will use it in cost cutting, rather than using an across-the-board arbitrary cut without any research to find if there already are some scholarships that are at a low enough level. A classic example is that we recently dropped football from 45 to 40, which is a pretty significant drop. Now we're being asked to cut another four scholarships over a two-year period.

I do not believe this is a cost-cutting measure. If the figures are accurate—I have no reason to believe they aren't—a good share of the people would not be saving any money. And those would be the ones who believe we should keep the scholarships at that higher level. I also believe this could have an affect on Title IX compliance. For a long time I have believed that we had to keep an open end in our conference on women's scholarships so that we will be allowed to give more than even some of our men's sports or in sports other than football and basketball. This has been our one out for determining that we could stay in Title IX compliance.

Furthermore, I am always concerned when we cut scholarships because we are affecting the student-athlete. There are many ways that we can cut. I believe in cost containment. I think we should research these with surveys such as the one used today. I believe there are many ways that I would be glad to cut costs. In fact, I would be glad to look at scholarship cuts. I thought Frank Cignetti had an interesting point. At least it was an attempt to do something in a sound manner that I think he has thought out. I'm not saying I would agree with Frank, but I do say that at least that it has been well thought out.

In closing, I believe there are some CEOs in this room, particularly those in private schools, who really believe that scholarship reduction

44 ______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

can be counterproductive, particularly in the area of enrollment. I have talked to two of our private schools. They feel that way very strongly. I urge the membership to put off this issue until we have thoroughly studied it. And I would ask that you defeat the measure.

Mr. Cignetti: I would like to speak in support of this legislation. And also encourage the development of legislation for next year's Convention for tuition and need-based aid to recover the opportunities that have been denied and give us a better opportunity to be equitable in Title IX.

Dave Dolch (Morningside College): I believe I'm in the right time zone now to speak about this proposal. I have a proposal from the AFCA convention to maintain the scholarship level that we currently have. The proposal was voted on by 62 active members of the AFCA. And that vote was 62-0 in favor of maintaining the scholarship proposals. Those coaches represented every Division II conference in the country.

I also say that this proposal hasn't been thought through. We have talked about the fact that further study is necessary. We have talked about the need for action. We have talked about the need for cost containment. But this is cost containment at the expense of studentathletes. We should further study it and come back with a better proposal.

Marilyn McNeil (California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo): I would like to point out for the membership that the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators opposes this for Title IX limitations that the gentleman spoke about.

Ms. Kuhn: I would like to make one comment. I'm one of the few people here that read NCAA Annual Reports. It's something that keeps me going in the night when I can't sleep. I read Annual Reports when this proposal for 10 percent cuts came two years ago.

If you read Annual Reports, you will see that the Division II Presidents Commission supported it at the time. I believe it was their understanding that it was going to come forward. But when it came to Division II, it was not supported by the Division II Steering Committee; therefore, it did not come to the Convention floor.

This proposal was not newly created. It was a proposal that should have been here a number of years ago.

[Proposal No. 64 (Page A-91) was approved by Division II, 116-74, one abstention, after motion for roll-call vote was approved. Later motion to reconsider was defeated.]

Honorary Academic Awards

Robert N. Evers (New Mexico Highlands University): I move Proposal No. 70.

[The motion was seconded.]

I feel this would be appropriate to reward students who have achieved high academic success at our institutions and not penalize them if the institution's grant were to exceed our cost of attendance.

[Proposal No. 70 (Page A-98) was approved by Division II.] [NOTE: The Division II business session was recessed at 3 p.m. and reconvened at 3:10 p.m.]

Division II Business Session

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Divisions I and II Playing and Practice Seasons—Individual Sports

Chuck Lindemenn (Humboldt State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move Proposal No. 88.

(The motion was seconded.)

Proposal 88 will permit member institutions' coaches in individual sports to participate in individual workout sessions with studentathletes from the coaches' team during the summer only, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete.

At the 1991 Convention, legislation was adopted to restrict participation during the summer in individual sports. Under the definition of practice, a coach would be precluded from providing individual assistance or conducting a workout with a student-athlete, even on an informal basis. For example, a student-athlete could not play in a racquetball or tennis match with his or her coach.

This proposal would permit individual interaction between a coach and a student-athlete at the student-athlete's request during the summer without compromising the principle underlying the prohibition. against out-of-season practice. It should be noted that the official interpretation related to this proposal would permit a coach to be involved with more than one student-athlete at a time, provided the request for assistance is initiated by each student-athlete.

This proposal is a fine-tuning measure recommended by the Council Subcommittee to Review 1991 Reform Proposals and is supported by the Council. We would urge your support for Proposal 88.

[Proposal No. 88 (Page A-118) was approved by Division II.]

Maximum Contest Limitations—Field Hockey

Craig P. Willis (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I move Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

While I am very much in support of the Presidents Commission and the changes that we're trying to make, I do not believe that this particular proposal comes within the spirit of that. I see it as a genderequity problem because field hockey does not have the same privilege that men's or women's soccer does. This proposal would take care of that problem. Therefore, I support it.

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I was happy to see the great support for soccer that was being expressed on a number of motions this morning. There are no two sports more similar than soccer and field hockey, and still uniquely different. In the East, there are many institutions like my own where we have women's field hockey and men's soccer playing at the same time; however, they're played under very different circumstances.

This proposal was conceived to approve a number of days in a nontraditional season for field hockey, which is the only sport covered by this legislation. Up until this time, we had not sought such dates because when we played indoor field hockey during the winter the institutions were able to do it at the students' expense. But it was considered under present legislation as an outside team.

We haven't been successful in having any change in that legislation on outside teams. So this proposal simply gives the nontraditional segment some dates for the indoor sport of hockey. When we considered this and talked with folks at the NCAA office, they suggested that the legislation be drawn as similar to soccer as possible. In doing that, the numbers that you see in the legislation were changed. Also, the term "dates of competition" was changed to "contests."

For Divisions I and II, it really has no effect. It was 20 dates or 20 contests for Division I, and it was 19 dates or 20 contests for Division II. Division III saw a problem. And I think it was probably on that basis that the Presidents Commission had some opposition to it.

But let me explain to you why there is no difference whatsoever. Field hockey adopted originally the dates of competition language because it is traditional in field hockey that an early preseason one-day tournament be played with shortened games. Franklin and Marshall College is a good example of an institution that sponsors such a tournament. Institutions have been standing in line for years to get into its tournament. In Division III, under 17 dates of competition, Franklin and Marshall would play four shortened games on that day and have 16

Under this new proposal, in changing to the word "contests," they would count all four of those games, subtracting four from the 20. They would come away from that same day with 16 contests left. So it doesn't expand in any way the regular-season competition. It does not fly in the - face of the reform effort. It simply gives to field hockey the same opportunity to have some playing season other than the 10 weeks of the

We would really appreciate your support.

[Proposal No. 92 (Page A-121) was approved by Division II.]

First Contest Date—Divisions I and II Soccer

Robert E. Hartwell (Adelphi University): I move Proposal No. 93. [The motion was seconded.]

I think the rationale for Proposal No. 93 is fairly clear. The first contest date would be changed from September 7. This allows another weekend of competition for soccer-playing institutions. It allows them the same type of traditional program as other fall sports.

Anthony James Catanese (Florida Atlantic University): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 93. During the 1991 Convention in an effort to assist institutions' athletics departments to reduce costs, the membership enacted legislation to preclude such institutions from competition in soccer until September 7. The legislation, in conjunction with legislation related to preseason practice opportunities, would result in many institutions incurring additional costs in necessary housing and feeding of student-athletes who must return to campus prior to the beginning of the institution's

ivision II Business Session	
	147

This legislation will permit institutions to begin competition on September 1, or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday and will result in institutions being able to bring the student-athletes back sooner to practice; in some instances even earlier than the old legislation, which was August 15.

Thus, the proposed legislation clearly is contrary to the reform idea of cost containment. I urge you to vote against Proposal 93.

Keith R. Phillips (Seattle Pacific University): I move Proposal No. 93-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

In deferrence to the gentleman who just spoke concerning the Presidents Commission, I think that this amendment-to-amendment addresses that fear. This simply would provide the same opportunity to soccer that the other fall sports have. It would bring it back into line with what we traditionally have been accustomed to doing. And it would be very helpful and very important in conducting our programs in the most appropriate way.

Robert E. Hartwell (Adelphi University): On behalf of Proposal No. 93-1, I really feel that when the Presidents Commission makes the statement about cost savings that it selects which proposal to make those statements against. I feel that this particular proposal isn't going to be costly. It's good legislation. It keeps soccer equivalent to football and volleyball.

[Proposal No. 93-1 (Page A-123) was approved by Division II.] [Proposal No. 93 (Page A-122) was approved by Division II, as amended by No. 93-1.]

Preseason Soccer Scrimmages

Robert E. Hartwell: (Adelphi University): I move Proposal No. 94. [The motion was seconded.]

Under previous legislation, the soccer-playing institutions really appreciated having scrimmages and exhibition games after the first contest; however, we really feel it's important to have our scrimmages and exhibition games prior to our first contest.

The Presidents Commission doesn't oppose this, so I hope the members vote in favor of it.

Mr. Ceddia: I would like to call the delegates' attention to the fact that there is an interpretation on Proposal 94.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): I haven't had time to look at that interpretation, but as the proud director of athletics at the only NCAA member institution that has had both men's and women's soccer teams play in the national championship game in one season, I am a little bit opposed to this. My soccer coaches will be unhappy to hear that.

I think three scrimmages are a little excessive, particularly if we're able to begin September 1, if that happens to pass. I think three is excessive. I think two would have been acceptable, and one, obviously.

Soccer players are very active year-round. I would have to oppose this on behalf of two very fine soccer programs.

48	1002	Convention	Proposition
. 40	 1992	Convention	Proceeding

Mr. Hartwell: Those three are optional. So you can either use them or you don't have to use them.

Karen Lockyer (Lewis University): Since we now have passed the same starting date for soccer that we have for women's volleyball, we're now allowing soccer to have scrimmages prior to the start of the first date, which will not keep it the same as women's volleyball and the other fall sports.

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): Point of information. I was going to ask the same question regarding Proposals 93 and 94. If legislation is brought by a single sport, is there any way under NCAA procedures for that to be extended to all sports that have their traditional season in that same time period rather than having each individual sport bring legislation in a piecemeal fashion? Couldn't we determine that September 1, or if it's on a Saturday or . Sunday, the Friday before, so it would be equally applicable to sports that have their traditional season in the fall?

Mr. Ceddia: I think your point is well taken. If you recall Dick Schultz's remarks yesterday near the conclusion of his comments, he put forth the possibility of federated sports regulations. And I think in some respects this would address the kind of issues that you are raising.

I think it is a matter that has the executive director's and Council's attention. I can't speak for the Council or the executive director to indicate when that might occur or how those adjustments would be made. But it is something that is going to be considered.

In the meantime, you can only make the changes through legislation. [Proposal No. 94 (Page A-123) was defeated by Division II.]

Recruiting—Collect and Toll-Free Telephone Calls James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): I move Proposal No.

126 on behalf of the NCAA Council.

[The motion was seconded.] This proposal is the Council's effort to confirm its position concerning the intent of Bylaw 13.1.2.4-(b)-(1), which was adopted at the 1991 Convention.

The Council believes toll-free calls initiated by the prospect, the prospect's parents or legal guardian should receive the same treatment as collect calls. The calls to toll-free numbers are made at the prospect's discretion and do not create additional recruiting pressure on the prospect. I urge your support of this proposal.

Terry Wanless (University of North Dakota): I don't know how many people have really looked into the cost of an 800 number. I know in our conference some schools had 800 numbers associated with their admissions office. My understanding is this would not preclude or in any way affect that kind of contact. It would only affect the direct relationship between the student-athlete and the athletics department. Is that correct?

There was some concern in our conference meetings if this would have any affect upon an institution having an 800 number in its

Division II Business Session	
	1/10

admissions office.

Mr. Ceddia: Exactly. This legislation has been proposed to deal with that.

Mr. Wanless: But this would also permit an 800 number in the athletics department, correct?

Mr. Ceddia: Yes. As I understand it, if a student-athlete calls the admissions office, that call can be transferred to the athletics department. That's what this would do. Otherwise, it would have to be screened. It's an either/or situation.

Mr. Wanless: The problem with this legislation, as I understand it, is that it would allow an athletics department to put in an 800 number to receive calls from recruited student-athletes. And having checked the cost of that, it is very cost enhancing. I see no problem with it in an admissions office. But I do see a major cost-enhancement issue when you deal with it in the athletics department.

Mr. Ceddia: In discussions of the Council, it was viewed as permissible legislation. Whether the institutions side with it or not is their choice.

Mr. Wanless: That's been the whole issue of the last three Convention votes - permissible legislation. We just voted down permissible legislation on scholarships. So I guess I don't agree with your ruling.

Mr. Ceddia: I'm just giving an interpretation. I'm not giving a ruling.

NEW COLUMN STATE OF THE STATE O

Mr. Fallis: I think the issue is that prospective student-athletes can make a collect call. If you're so inclined to put in an 800 number, you may find that it's cheaper than to keep accepting collect calls. You can now take the collect call.

We're clarifying that if you have an 800 number, No. 1, they can call in on that 800 number; No. 2, if you want to put in an 800 number, you can do that, too. If you don't want to do either of those, if you want to keep accepting collect calls, go ahead and do that. And if you think that's less costly, I have news for you. It's not.

The problem is if you don't adopt this and you have an 800 number the first response to prospective students or their parents is going to be, "Are you calling us on the 800 number? I'm sorry, I can't talk to you." I don't think that's what you want.

Joanne Kuhn (Texas Woman's University): Texas state universities may not accept collect calls. So if we do not have an 800-number option, then we are prohibited from accepting any calls coming in at all. That makes it difficult.

Gene A. Carpenter (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): Do we need to be in the phone business in Division II?

Charles A. Eberle (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): I want some clarification. Isn't the point of Proposal 126 that at present you can't accept these calls until July 1 following the prospect's junior year? Isn't the intent of this one to allow it at any time? It's my understanding you cannot accept collect calls. And we can put in tollfree lines. So are we talking about what the legislation is trying to do or

150 ______ 1992 Convention Proceedings are.we all over the page?

Mr. Ceddia: The Chair has been advised that this legislation would make it any time.

Mr. Eberle: That's what I understand. But isn't it permissible at present to accept collect calls and use a toll-free line? Isn't that something you're permitted to do right now? This says you can do it at s any time; whereas, presently you have to wait until July 1 following the prospect's junior year in high school.

Mr. Ceddia: The Chair has been advised that Proposal 126 would give you more flexibility. Any time would apply.

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): There is concern that athletics departments are going to institute a toll-free number because of the nature of Proposals 126 and 127.

Proposal 126 was sponsored by the Pacific-10 Conference, among others, because a Pacific-10 athletics department bought an 800 number. I don't think most of us will do that. But Proposal 127 would preclude that.

-So if the membership is concerned about that, it could vote down Proposal 126 and then approve Proposal 127. The interpretation specifically states that the athletics department could not buy the number.

[Proposal No. 126 (Page A-154) was approved by Division II, 104-88, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

Contacts Subsequent to Signing the National Letter of Intent

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): On behalf of the NCAA Recruting Committee and NCAA Council, I move to adopt Proposal No. 138.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 138 is a fine-tuning proposal that will clarify whether a member institution's coach may contact a prospective student-athlete's relative or legal guardian at the site of a competition.

The adoption of this proposal will eliminate Bylaw 13.1.1.4-(b), which precludes this type of contact during a dead period. There is no need to continue this restriction on contact during a dead period after a prospective student-athlete has signed a national letter of intent. This will avoid embarrassing and awkward situations for our coaches and

I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 138 (Page A-165) was approved by Division II.]

Distribution of Graduation-Rates Report

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move Proposal No. 140.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal clarifies institutional responsibilities related to the distribution of graduation-rates information to prospective studentathletes and other interested parties.

As you know, effective annually beginning July 1, 1993, Division II

ivision II Business Sessioi	n	
January Schall	' — 	151

will submit enrollment and graduation-rates information to the NCAA national office. After this information is compiled and checked, each institution will receive a two-page report that summarizes enrollment and graduation data. Each institution then will distribute its report as specified under legislation.

Proposal No. 140 will help ensure that that distribution of the report is consistent with the Federal Student-Athlete Right to Know Act, because like the Act, it specifies that the reports must be provided to the prospective student-athlete's guidance office, as well as to the prospect, the prospect's parents and the prospect's coaches.

This proposal also clarifies that the report must be provided at the earliest opportunity during a recruiting process, or upon request consistent with the spirit of the Act and the intent behind the Association's original legislation related to this matter.

[Proposal No. 140 (Page A-167) was approved by Division II.]

General

Mr. Ceddia: That concludes the official voting that we were responsible for under the federated principles in this business session. I was asked earlier by a member if it would be possible to take a straw vote on Proposal 34. Although Robert's Rules does not recognize a straw vote, on the advice of the Parliamentarian the Chair has been told that he can ask for a straw vote on Proposal 34, which is Division I-AAA football.

Charles A. Eberle (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): I think we're the largest football-playing conference in Division II. All 14 of our members sponsor football. We've looked at the legislation. We've don't feel it poses a threat to Division II football. And we are going to support it.

[NOTE: In a straw vote, the Division II members voted in opposition to Proposal No. 34.]

Mr. Ceddia: Ladies and gentlemen, is there any other business to bring before this session? Your body action tells me that there is none. I want to thank you for your attention.

[The Division II business session was adjourned at 4 p.m.]

Division III Business Session

Wednesday Morning, January 8, 1992

The Division III business session was called to order at 8:10 a.m., with Rocco J. Carzo, Tufts University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Carzo: Welcome to the Division III business session. We appreciate the prompt response that we are getting in terms of settling down to get this session started.

[NOTE: Various announcements and introductions were made.]
At last year's Convention there were essentially two themes that we addressed throughout the business session. I would like to commend you on the progress that we made last year through those sessions.

There was a great deal of discussion. There were some very sensitive issues. A lot of discussion went back and forth. The steering committee took that very much to heart. We were appreciative and felt that it was an extremely good working session.

We generally revolved around two themes last year. One was restructuring the divisions to bring about a better consistency to competitive alignment by trying to match institutional philosophy with resources, facilities and athletics programs.

Narrowed down, the theme was we felt Division III should be for Division III. And we made considerable progress in that direction.

The second theme was cost containment and time demands on student-athletes. We made some very good progress in that area also. There was a lot of discussion that showed intense interest by a very diverse group. The fact that we came out with some mutualities was very rewarding to all of us.

At the Convention the restructuring went reasonably well. And brought before us at this Convention will be the Division I-AAA legislation. We ask you to continue to support that legislation. It gives us championships just for Division III and it does not disenfranchise them from championship opportunities. So we ask you to continue to support that as strongly as possible.

Last year, we also dealt with the transfer eligibility predicated on academic eligibility at the previous institution.

was the effect that the distribution of the revenue had on Division III.
We resorted to no-block grant funding, which meant that our championship allocation was budgeted now as opposed to being determined each year when the revenues were assessed. When we had the block-

Division III Business Session

grant funding, money that was not used was put into reserve. That reserve has been eliminated now in order that we may become a budgeted expense and that we would have a constant amount of money for the championships.

Our championship allocation grew from \$800,000 to \$3.9 million, which was extremely impressive. We also went to a much higher per diem. Rosters were increased to allow us to pay for coaches as well as some additional personnel. By virtue of the revenue distribution we also received catastrophic insurance coverage, which was a significant cost containment and a budget reduction for most of our institutions.

One other thing that we tried to accomplish last year that is listed in the proposals for this year is to attempt to get playing rules by division. We will discuss that later because the proposal is in our voting order. We have to have some discussion about that, but we have made progress in that direction.

We tried to assess last year at the close of our business session what, you said to us that would help us come back this year to better meet, your needs. We worked extremely hard to try to make sure that whatever we did represented what you wanted. One of the things you, told us was that legislation that we present to you should be relevant to Division III and should be based essentially on the Division III philosophy.

We took that as a guiding premise for what we brought to you today. Secondly, we extracted from your comments the fact that legislation should maintain the spirit of deregulation that was started two years ago. It should be simple and allow for ease of application. That was a very good mandate to us. You cannot believe how extremely difficult that is to achieve, but we kept it in mind with everything that we did,

Three, you said that the legislation should allow for differences among institutions, both philosophically and geographically. That was also extremely difficult to achieve. If you look at the first two and compare it with the third, you know that we are beginning to drive ourselves apart by what we were asking to be accomplished. We want you to know how difficult it is to achieve all these things. But we tried to keep them all in mind as we went through and drafted the legislation we presented to you.

More than the first three issues that you brought before us, the thing that we felt that you said to us more than anything else was that the legislation should reflect the principles of fairness and equal opportunity in all sports. We took that to heart because we felt that that is the one, thing that was more important than the others. And you asked us to fine tune those things that we did last year to bring before you this year.

We have worked extremely hard at trying to do that and satisfy your needs. When we looked at all those things, the steering committee felt? that maybe just reviewing the minutes of the past sessions and recording all of the comments that we recalled and the general drift or it the spirit of what you tried to tell us was not enough. So we tried to gather some more information to make sure that we were on the right;

were in line with what we thought we had recorded by ourselves.

Additionally, we tried to gather some information from a cross-section of people around the country. We got the information from the North Coast Athletic Conference survey, which was very interesting and also will be presented to you this morning. We had some representatives at the NADCA convention. They recorded the general responses at that convention to bring back to the steering committee. We took all the information that we had and coordinated it to try to reflect the mutuality of interests, concerns and suggestions that we thought you wanted us to consider.

From that point on, we appointed a subcommittee to frame up the legislation to provide some options for you. When we got to that point, we felt that we had to focus in a little bit better to be sure that we were focusing a little more specifically and to get away from the general aspects of the guiding mandates that you had given to us to try to develop a charge to ourselves from you. And essentially, what we felt that we were trying to do for you is to maintain competitive equity for steering committee should develop a consistent method of defining length of season, number of contests and preseason practice opportunities to assure the concern for competitive equity.

That is a very heavy charge, a very strong charge and a very complicated charge. I think you should be proud of the amount of time and effort that your steering committee put in on trying to achieve that goal. The proposals that are coming up for you to vote on essentially do not reflect provincial, regional or sports-specific interests. They are designed to treat seasonal sports participation as equitably as possible for all sports in that season. Actually, they are very close as far as all seasons are concerned. We think that the proposals are simple and consistent based on the previous rationale that I expressed to you that

These proposals additionally reflect the Presidents Commission's charge. It made a statement to us to say that the basic principles of cost reduction and reducing time demands on student-athletes should not be sacrificed in drafting legislation. With those thoughts in mind, we came up with the legislation that you are looking at today and that you will vote on sometime later in the meeting. They essentially provide for you three options. None of these options are the same as last year. I think it is important to remember that when you are voting.

One option is an expression of Resolution 117 from last year's resolution. That is Proposal No. 32. You remember that we had that resolution and it mandated the steering committee to come up with a number of components to provide a package for you at this Convention. The second option is an expansion of that proposal drafted by the steering committee. That is Proposal No. 31. The third option is the present set of parameters that were voted on last year and some cleanup legislation that is required for that to go into effect.

So those general options are before you. We ask you to remember that it is extremely difficult if you mix and match those proposals. We ask you to vote on them in their entirety, the way they are presented; either one of the three, whichever you choose. There are some amendments that are applicable, but we ask you not to mix and match them. Later this morning you will get some historical background on the Division III growth as well as a little better clarification of the three options that you have available to you. I will leave it at this point so we can deal with that in a little more detail.

I have attempted to tell you what we are doing and why. Let me offer one other comment before we go into the official business session. No interpretations will be made by the Chair. We will attempt to clarify, if at all possible. We also have people who will be the presenters for those proposals who will deal with that clarification.

That concludes my opening remarks in terms of where we are, where we plan on going and what we have prepared for you at this point.

Now I would like to ask Mary Barrett to please make a report of the Executive Committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Executive Committee

Mary R. Barrett (University of Massachusetts, Boston): Among the most significant actions of the Executive Committee during 1990-91 were the approval of components of the plan for distributing moneys. from the seven-year \$1 billion television contract with CBS and the approval of a record general operating budget in the amount of approximately \$168 million.

In doing so, the Executive Committee noted that NCAA members will receive direct payments from more than 60 percent of the budget. A total of \$100 million will be returned directly to the membership, \$72 million of which will be in direct payments from the revenue-distribution plan. Member institutions will receive \$25 million to cover transportation and per diem for NCAA championships and \$34 million in benefits or 20 percent of this budget. Student and youth programs will receive \$8 million, which is 5.2 percent of the budget, while the national office expenses will be \$22 million, approximately 13 percent. Also included in the budget is approximately a million-plus in the form of a membership trust.

After a 11/2-year study, the Special Advisory Committee to Review Recommendations Regarding Distribution of Revenues in May submitted its final recommendations for the distribution of moneys to the NCAA membership for 1990-91. The Executive Committee determined that the special committee would remain intact through 1991-92 in order to monitor and evaluate the plan and to recommend adjustments as necessary to ensure the principles upon which it was based were met.

The components of the plan include the following: A needy student athlete fund and a \$3.5 million catastrophic injury insurance plan. Allstudent-athletes in all divisions are covered in the event of catastrophic.

1992 Convention Proceedings >

injury while playing or practicing. An academic enhancement fund—a \$1.3 million scholarship fund. Awards are made to student-athletes to complete their degrees or postgraduate work. Further awards are made to ethnic minorities and women to obtain advanced degrees in athletics administration. A \$24.6 million championships expense. Transportation and per diem for official traveling parties were increased in all divisions. There are grant-in-aid funds, sport sponsorship funds and scholarship funds. There also is a \$1 million allocation for the Division II enhancement fund. These moneys were distributed among the Division III membership according to the formula developed by the championships committee. This will continue on a regulated basis for the remainder of the television contract.

In approving this record budget, the Executive Committee also eliminated the Divisions II and III championships allocations that previously had been made from the Association's reserve fund, which had been mentioned in past reports of the Executive Committee and included as line items in the Association's budget. These allocations had been a block-grant type of allocation for the payment of transportation and per diem expenses for championships in those divisions.

As line items, and this is very important, in the 1991-92 budget, any year-end overage or surplus in those accounts will be included in the overall NCAA surplus or deficit. In addition, in the August meeting, the Executive Committee emphasized the importance of financial planning and the ability to prioritize funding requests. In doing so, it adopted a spolicy that all NCAA committees, the Presidents Commission and the Council begin fiscal planning using three-year cycles and submit any requests with budgetary impact no later than the Executive Committee's May meeting. I think the membership needs to be reminded about that. Tam sure you will hear more about it in the various committee reports.

In addition, other actions that we took during the year included reviewing issues relating to automatic qualification and the size of championship fields. The Executive Committee reaffirmed its longstanding view that NCAA championship competition is intended to provide competition among the best and the most elite teams and student-athletes. They are not to be considered as all-comers meets.

Further, the Executive Committee noted that in the spirit of cost containment evident in the 1991 Convention and our member institutions' own campuses, that it was not inclined to consider at this time an expansion of any championship bracket unless there was a compelling indication of growth in the particular sport.

In the area of drug testing, the Executive Committee reviewed the results of the Association's championships and year-round drugtesting programs. Upon the recommendation of the NCAA Special Planning Committee for Drug Testing, the Executive Committee authorized the Administrative Committee to allocate funds at the appropriate time, if necessary, to assist with start-up costs for laboratory-certification programs. The special committee also will continue its work until December 1992.

In dealing with certain sports and championships, the Executive Committee, with its fiscal responsibilities, also approved a revision of the format of the Division I Men's Ice Hockey Championship to provide for two single-elimination regional tournaments at predetermined sites. It also approved the conduct of the Division III Men's Lacrosse Championship on the day between the semifinals and the finals of the Division I Men's Lacrosse Championship at the same site. We will wait to see how that works out in terms of the fiscal implications. We also denied increases in the field size for the National Collegiate Men's Volleyball and the Division I Women's Soccer and Men's Ice Hockey Championships, the Division II Men's Soccer and Women's Volleyball, Baseball and Wrestling Championships and the Division III Women's Basketball Championships. Increases were approved for the Divisions II and III Women's Soccer Championships effective in 1991 and 1992, respectively.

There are a number of other issues that we addressed, but some of these other items will be mentioned in the championships report. So I would like to just include some of the actions we took in our December meeting relative to proposals that will be on the floor of the Convention and many of which will be discussed in the Division III session.

We reaffirmed support of Proposal No. 87, postseason football games. We reaffirmed support for Proposal No. 118, division-specific playing rules. We agreed to oppose Proposal No. 141, NCAA-sponsored summer basketball camps. That is going to be discussed in further detail. It probably would be better if the NCAA rethought it in terms of discussion. Rather than sponsor, just to certify.

We agreed to support Proposal No. 144, disciplinary measures. We agreed to support Proposal No. 145, which basically deals with Division II championships in women's field hockey, men's ice hockey and men's lacrosse. The proposal was basically discussed in previous Conventions and the spirit was to support it.

We reaffirmed support for Proposals 146 and 147, which are the championships criteria. We reaffirmed opposition to Proposal No. 148, which was the Sunday championships competition. The sponsors have indicated they have withdrawn No. 148.

We agreed to oppose Proposal No. 149. The Executive Committee supports Proposal No. 151, Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, to increase the size of that committee. And we agreed to take no position on Proposal No. 152, which was the compliance committee discussion. We agreed to oppose Proposal No. 143, basically not seeing demonstrated need for the change in terms of the rules there.

This is just an overview of the committee's actions through the year. I would like to remind you that all details of all committees are published in The NCAA News and the abridged minutes are in NCAA Annual Reports.

This concludes the report of the Executive Committee.

Division III Championships Committee

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): I am pleased to present the

158 1992 Convention Proceedings

greport of the Division III Championships Committee.

The five-person committee is composed of Division III Vice-President and committee chair Rocco Carzo of Tufts University; the Division III Executive Committee representative, Mary Barrett, of the University of Massachusetts, Boston; two Division III Council representatives, myself and Arthur Eason of William Paterson College, and one member selected at large, Sam Bedrosian of Aurora University.

The specific duties of the championships committee appear on Page 372 of the 1991-92 NCAA Manual. As you may know, the committee meets three times a year—May, August and December—to review and evaluate sports committee recommendations and is charged with making recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding policies and conduct of Division III championships. This includes allocation of funds within the budget specified by the Executive Committee, supervising qualification and/or selection procedures, maintaining oversight responsibilities for applicable playing regulations in the areas of player safety, financial impact and image of the sport, and processing other issues related to the administration of events.

Through Chair Carzo, the Division III Championships Committee thas been committed to a process of open communication with sport committee chairs, including invitations to appear at our meetings to speak to significant issues when appropriate.

Concerning financial allocations, as Mary indicated, championship reserves have been eliminated. Divisions II and III now have line-item budget allocations. This has necessitated a three-year sport committee budget planning guideline where budgetary requests are annually considered only in May. This was somewhat of a moratorium this past year on any requests to our committee of a financial nature. All such requests will be considered this May.

In regard to championship sites, the Executive Committee has affirmed the existing 500-mile radius policy for our championships, which states at least 25 percent of the participants in the last three years must have come from within 500 miles of the site. Previously, the championships committee was interested in as much rotation of sites among regions as possible when financially feasible. However, now sports committees must exercise even greater care when recommending championship sites and pay particular consideration to transportation expense was up 19.7 percent, which is in part due to the rise in airfares, the Persian Gulf war and fewer airlines; and with changes in transportation and per diem policies, the number of trips naturally increased.

Concerning playing rules, the drafting of legislation permitting the divisional championships committee to approve appeals for division-specific exceptions to playing rules when it may have a significant monetary impact on the membership of the division appears as Proposal No. 118. This is important legislation to Division III. As Rocco mentioned, it will give us flexibility in these areas. This proposal has been prompted by the football goal post and 25-second clock rule

changes.

Regarding our regionalization concept for our championships, the Division III Championships Committee and Executive Committee approved the following statement regarding the regional selection of championship participants: "The Division III championships philosophy is to field the most competitive teams as possible while minimizing missed class time, to emphasize regional competition in regular-season scheduling and to provide regional representation in NCAA championship competition by allocating specific births per region or by regional pairings and seedings, realizing that this may be done at the expense of leaving out some championship-caliber teams." The governing sports committees apply this regionalization concept in different ways, which is being further studied and will be reviewed at our May meeting.

In conclusion, it is important that the membership continually access the sports committees and the Division III Championships Committee to voice opinions, concerns and suggestions in these areas. You should particularly note the championships committee and Executive Committee minutes that appear in The NCAA News. Correspondence with sports committees copied to the championships committee aids both committees in working jointly to respond appropriately.

On behalf of the committee, I would like to thank all of you who have taken the time to communicate with our committee and who have assisted us in trying to do what was right for Division III. I also would like to thank the outgoing Chair and Division III Vice-President, Rocco Carzo, for his leadership, wisdom, dedication and great sense of humon on the Division III Championships Committee. Thank you, Rocco.

This concludes the committee report.

Mr. Carzo: Thank you very much, David. Let me reiterate what Dave mentioned at the end of his report. If you have any concerns comments or suggestions, please feel free to write directly to the championships committee. I assure you that it will consider anything that is sent.

We had last year probably more input, not only for the championships committee, but for the Division III Steering Committee in general, than we have ever had. We really like that because it tells us that you are paying attention and you really feel strongly about where we are going

North Coast Athletic Conference Survey

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): In June 1987, the NCAA Presidents Commission issued a policy paper titled Agenda for Reform.

This policy paper included the rationale for an 18-month national forum on the proper role of intercollegiate athletics within higher, education. To support that forum, the Presidents Commission sponsored a study to identify the effects participation in intercollegiate athletics had on student-athletes. The American Institutes for Research of Palok Alto, California, was contracted to do the study, which began in November of 1987 and ran through 1988. A survey of Division is student-athletes in that academic year was conducted on 42 Division in

campuses at the cost of about \$1.5 million.

The results of that survey have been the basis for much of the presidents' reform proposals over the last three years affecting playing Fand practice regulations in the NCAA. Have similar reform proposals for Division III also been based on those Division I survey results? This question has been the topic of conjecture for several years now. The comments we have heard are that the Division III reform proposals have come with no basis or similar survey in Division III. It was with this thought in mind that the North Coast Athletic Conference grappled with the issues of playing and practice seasons last winter. Our conference felt a need to get some real information on these very issues. With this in mind, our playing and practice seasons committee headed by Dr. John Martin, director of athletics at Ohio Wesleyan University, commissioned a survey based on the Division I survey that was done in 1988. The survey addressed the questions of time demands for academics in athletics as well as student attitudes regarding those commitments and other facets of being a collegiate athlete.

Before I get into the results of the survey, I thought it would be helpful for you to know a little bit about the North Coast Athletic Conference membership so you can assess whether the survey results would be helpful to you. The North Coast Athletic Conference consists of nine Division III colleges and universities in Ohio, Indiana and Pennsylvania. We are private academically selective and mainly liberal arts institutions with an average enrollment of 2,000 that is divided pretty evenly between men and women. We sponsor 21 championship sports, 11 for men, 10 for women, and our proportion of ্র freshmen who participate in intercollegiate athletics is an average of 27 percent on our campuses. The members are Allegheny College, Case Western Reserve University, Denison University, Earlham College, Kenyon College, Oberlin College, Ohio Wesleyan University, Wittenberg University and the College of Wooster. While we are proud of our academic performance, we are also proud of our athletics achievements. In the majority of our men's and women's sports, we have been consistently represented nationally each year by one or more of our teams. In the last four years, three of our members have claimed Division III championships.

We feel we had a successful survey, but not a very sophisticated one compared to Division I. We collected nearly 1,200 surveys, which represents just over 25 percent of all of our student-athletes in all of our sports. You have a hand-out of comparison charts that we balanced against the Division I survey if you would like to follow along.

Basically, the key results of the survey show that in our conference the inseason and out-of-season time demands are significantly lower than Division I. The NCAA News also was nice enough to do a report on the survey; however, it did not include the comparisons to Division I. I guess that is okay because Division I has gone forward and made a number of legislative changes based on that survey. But I think it is important for us to have the comparison because this is what we have

been talking about for the last three years.

The No. 1 result from the survey is that our student-athletes spendless than 20 hours—it was 19.6 hours—per week on athletics during the traditional playing season while Division I football and basketball players spend 30 hours and participants in other Division I sports spend 24 hours. That is a maximum of 35 percent more in Division I our conference student-athletes also lose less class time during the season than our Division I counterparts, missing 1.2 classes per week as compared to 2.0 per week for Division I football and basketball and 2.2 for other Division I athletes.

I want to note that in both surveys participants were asked how many classes they missed per week for any reason. That is sickness sleeping in, etc., and not just athletics. There also are significant differences in time demands between the NCAC and Division I when nontraditional seasons are considered. NCAC athletes cut their mains sport activity by more than 50 percent out of season, down to 9.7 hours per week.

Division I athletes in football and basketball are at 17.9 hours perweek, almost our main season time; while other Division I sports occupy 15.6 hours in the nontraditional season. Missed classes dropped to 1.1 per week for Division I athletes during the nontraditional season while NCAC athletes are still lower at 0.8. All in all, the time demands of athletics in the NCAC, both in season and out of season, were far less than those surveyed in Division I. Some of our presidents had hoped our students would have reported more study time in the survey; but, on average we still do okay. The nine member schools graduate nearly 75 percent of their students in a five-year period, so they are getting it done.

As a reflection of the Division III philosophy, an overwhelming majority of our student-athletes felt in response to some questions it was of the greatest importance that their coaches encourage players to do well in their courses and keep track of how well players are doing in their courses. While many acknowledge that being a college athlete made it more difficult to keep up with course work and to study for exams, an 85 percent majority said they believed they managed their time much better than other students on their campus.

We often talk about the lifetime lessons learned through intercollegiate athletics. This is part of the survey. Our survey showed that a significant majority felt that they were far better prepared as a college athlete to do the following: A. assume leadership responsibility; B. exercise self-control; C. set and achieve personal goals; D. learn from mistakes; E. develop new abilities and skills; F. take responsibility for others, and G. learn about themselves. We felt that was a tribute to our programs and the things we are doing.

Three of our 14 survey questions were asked to determine the myth or reality of the multisport athlete in the NCAC and Division III because this is a question we have all asked recently. Seventy-three percent of our respondents have played two or more sports in high

school. Once in college, 68 percent of our respondents focused on just one sport while 27 percent played two or more sports. Evidently, we still have a significant minority that are multisport athletes, about 25 percent, but most of our athletes have settled on one sport once in college.

A collateral question to this also was revealing. When asked about the attitude of their main sport head coach regarding participation in other sports, 55 percent said their coach encouraged participation in another sport. However, we are concerned about the 19 percent who said their coach discouraged or forbid participation in other sports.

"The results of this survey were gratifying to our membership, especially our athletics administrators. They said it showed that we are operating our broad-based programs for both men and women successfully and with a reasonable amount of excellence. We are doing that with time demands that are in balance with other components of college life.

And just a few notes on the survey as I finish. We selected 12 questions from the Division I survey and added two of our own, for a total of 14 questions. Many of these questions were long, multipart questions. The Division I survey had 116 questions. We deliberately did not break out football or basketball separately, as was done in the Division I survey, because we treat our student-athletes equally by sport. As a result, those comparisons to the Division I survey are not available. Many of our members did code the questionnaires by sex and sport so we could tell we had a representative result for men and women as well as a good cross-section of our sports.

We believe this may be the first survey of its kind done in Division III on these issues. We are glad to share it with the NCAA membership. However, conditions change very quickly, and even by the time these results were presented to our conference this past May, the dynamics of this past year were already bearing down on our leadership.

We did acknowledge that the results proved we were doing a good job for the student-athlete. Despite that, as all of you in higher education today are aware, we are coming to grips with the national economic recession coupled with the long projected depression and available student population. This is making all of us look at playing and practice season issues in a completely different light right now.

In conclusion, I would just like to recognize several people who were helpful with the survey. First, I want to salute Rocco for reaching out to the membership, as he did with our conference. I think this is one of the hallmarks of Rocco's tenure. He has done a great job in that regard. I want to thank John Martin, director of athletics at Ohio Wesleyan, who was our chair and did a super job and spent a lot of time with this committee. I want to thank Ursula Walsh, director of research at the NCAA who kind of helped us along, not being survey experts. I also want to thank my wife and my children as well as my secretary and her children for tallying all the survey results. This is Division III folks. This was done for a cost well under \$1.5 million.

_ 1992 Convention Proceedings

Division III Business Session

Mr. Carzo: Thank you very much, Dennis. That was a great job. Part of the Division III Steering Committee's approach over the years has been to try to figure out which things would be most helpful to you and most relevant. We really were impressed by the amount of effort and detail that Dennis' conference put into the survey. We wanted to share that with you because we thought it was relevant to all of our schools.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Division III Steering Committee

Mr. Carzo: In the past, we sat through these meetings and watched Division III struggle through this attempt to become a federated division. We saw the previous constituencies work in that direction. We were not sure whether everyone realized how much we progressed in the past three or four years and we felt that it was important for you to get some historical perspective on where we have come from and the kind of growth that has taken place in our division. We have asked Jenshillingford, the senior member of our steering committee, to prepare a report for you along those lines.

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): I want to digress from the report for just a moment and introduce to you your four student-athletes who represent Division III on the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

I will read their names so that you can greet them.

Rich Kacmarynski from Central College (Iowa); Cheryl Ish, Salisbury State University; Katherine Marshall, Emory University; Matt Leight ninger, Haverford College. They are a great group.

I would like to start by saying that in August of this year, a group referred to me as an old pro. In October, I was described as a legend Rocco just called me the senior member of this group. And I am here to discuss the history of Division III. It does give one pause to ponder.

I am happy today to take a few minutes, however, to highlight some of the happenings that have occurred in the last 19 years. But I caution you that I have only lived through 10 of them. I am aware there are those in this room who could do a much better job. But perhaps what I can bring to you will help to set the stage for what we decide during this Convention. It certainly may assist us as we continue to chart a sound course for the future.

In 1973, a considerable discussion revolved around the restructure of the NCAA. It was the year that consideration was first initiated to they changing from university and college divisions to our present three divisions.

Over a period of several years, we have successfully experienced a reorganization of our own legislation and our own competitive structures to provide for self-determination as we hope to have it here to accommodate the interests of our several groups—large, small, state; public institutions, etc.

From the beginning, we were emphasizing self-determination. We're know today that the same diversity characterizes our division. In the

end, however, the proposal failed by a mere six votes.

in August of that year, a special Convention was called. A discussion of the three divisions and their respective characteristics followed. And all again agreed that self-determination was the most significant factor.

**At one juncture, a delegate raised a question regarding how voting would take place and asked, and I quote, "Should all legislation of the Association be adopted with the three divisions meeting in a joint session of the Convention?" He was assured that such would be the case and that all discussion would be heard. I mention that because what actually has occurred is federation that has gone the other direction and I believe that has been actually beneficial to us. I am one of those who has done a 180 on that.

. During the special Convention, the restructure actually did take place. We did away with university and college status and began our division as we know it today.

In January of 1974, the Council was restructured to represent this change. And in the Division III discussions, some of the criteria for membership was described as follows: "All forms of financial assistance for student-athletes must be handled through the regular college agencies set up for all students using the financial aid office. Financial assistance may be offered only by the director of financial aid, or a similar person, in writing and not before the student had been admitted.

"The assistance offered each year may not exceed financial aid as determined by the college scholarship service except for honor awards. Honor awards for student-athletes may not exceed \$300 each academic year. They may be offered by an institution when the financial aid is less than \$300 or even when there is no need. All financial assistance received by the student-athlete from sources outside the institution must be reported to the director of financial aid. When outside aid is received after the financial aid program of the college has been offered to the student, the director of financial aid must be notified and an adjustment of the aid already offered must take place."

So you can see that some of our battles have been fought a number of different ways in a number of different times. From 1973 to the present, Division III membership has grown from 238 institutions to 331. Time passed as the three divisions developed their own personalities. And in 1977, President Ken Weller, "Mr. Philosophy," began the arduous task of outlining that statement for Division III.

In 1981, the unfortunate demise of the AIAW brought the issues of women's programs to the forefront in the NCAA. In 1982, Don Russell presided over a meeting of Division III CEOs and Council and Executive Committee members. At that meeting, Ken Weller again introduced the subject of Division III philosophy, suggesting that for the past six years divisions had distinguished themselves by the way in which their institutions gave financial aid. Another delegate suggested that serious problems had occurred in intercollegiate athletics, an

1002	Convention	- D	41
1992	Conventio	n Procee	n_0

astute observation. Betty Kruczek reviewed the issues related to women's athletics and discussed some of the criteria for Division III. And finally in August of 1981, the Division III philosophy as it appears on Page 360 of your Manual was developed.

As Division III institutions attempted to work with their philosophy and within it, a number of problems evolved. The growth of the scope of individual institutional programs was almost universal. Championships became an enticing carrot for athletics programs but were not without difficulty. And concern emerged for maintaining the level competitive playing field.

In 1985, at the urging of the Division III Steering Committee, a study of Division III conferences included such factors as the number of contests, starting and ending dates of seasons, and the dates for the beginning of the practices and when they were to be initiated. And how is that for a familiar ring? That was 1985, folks.

Three years ago, an enrollment profile of Division III schools showed at 10 schools with 10,000 or more enrolled, 76 with enrollments of 2,500 to 10,000 and 235 with enrollments under 2.500.

As we continue, the Presidents Commission was born in Texas. Proposition 48 became the most controversial piece of legislation for Divisions I and II. Dick Schultz was selected as our executive director and the fun just continued. Divisions I and II, under the urging of the Presidents Commission, set about strengthening academics and regaining control of their athletics programs.

In 1987, a second attempt was made to legislate maximum number of contests as well as the length of playing seasons. It was a slow process. During the next few years abuses in Divisions I and II programs seemed to dominate the sports page, as they do today, and a study was initiated for Division I athletes. The conclusions indicated that Division I student-athletes had too many time demands by athletics and that the financial side of athletics had gone astray. The study as well as the Knight Commission report and pressure from the Federal government to intervene, as Dick alluded to yesterday, were factors that initiated the reform package. So today we come to Anaheim to discuss the second part of the reform package.

As a division, we have spent many years discussing transfer rules, an assortment of financial awards, the number of appropriate contests for our institutions, the proper length of playing seasons and a myriad of other issues. We have visited most of them several times. To a degree, we have become over-regulated. Philosophically, we have weighed institutional autonomy and self-determination with the need for regulation of our championships and the establishment of standards that would provide equitable competitive situations.

Last year, as Dennis suggested, many of you suggested that the reform effort was based on a Division I study of student-athletes and that it did not apply to Division III. I would suggest that maybe it is more important to look at the reform objectives to best determine the needs of Division III. Do we as institutions need cost reduction and are

we placing extensive time demands on our student-athletes?

it is my personal contention that most of our athletes are not subject to time demands. I think that the North Coast Athletic Conference study upholds that. But I know that most of our colleges and universities are under the financial gun.

I would interject a third objective for you to consider as you continue through the legislative part of this session—the maintenance of a level playing field. I believe if the proposed legislation can be evaluated on the terms of cost reduction, time demands and equitable competitive situations, that sound decisions will be made for our institutions within the NCAA Division III framework.

Contrary to Rocky's suggestion in one of our steering committee meetings that I have all the answers, I believe that each of you has his or her own answer that is appropriate to your institution. As steering committees of the past have sought sensible solutions to the problems and growth of Division III, I believe your present steering committee that the ongoing committee will be listening as well.

On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I want to offer some information that I believe may be helpful in terms of understanding the options before the membership today. Remember that the steering committee was charged with staying within the Division III philosophy, simplifying the reform proposal and developing a consistent method for defining the length of playing seasons, number of contests and preseason opportunities.

The operative words there were simplification and consistency. With these stated guiding principles in mind, let me define the respective options available to you. This is an attempt to clarify issues and to offer a road map for the membership.

Please save your tomatoes for the legislative system. At that time there will be ample time for the membership to debate the positions. But the steering committee believes it has an obligation to place the options before you.

ric. First, it is important to remember that the rules governing the number of contests and the start of playing and practice seasons will change in August 1992 because of previous legislation. They were passed last year as part of the reform package. To remind you, this includes reducing the number of contests and retains the present 21 weeks for the playing season.

Road map time. We have two aids. One appears on Page 177 of your Program and it goes through Page 180. Those four pages refer to what is now in the Manual. The first page refers to fall sports, the second winter, the third spring and the fourth refers to National Collegiate Championships that are open to all divisions.

You also have a pink chart that has Option 1 or Proposal 31. It is supported by the Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council. It is characterized by the following: An 18-week playing season within a 19-week period. The starting dates are established by counting back from

66	1992	Convention	Proceedia
	1792	Convention	Proceed

the championships to the start of the competitive season.

There is one addition to Appendix C in your Program that I think is important. You will see that the dates of either the start of competition in the fall or the start of practice have been placed on this sheet for your assistance. This is what will happen if we count back 19 straight weeks. For your clarification, this is a "clock is running" type of counting back. The steering committee has attached an amendment that deals with swimming. We have added a week because the sport does not have a qualifying round into its championships such as a regional or a semifinal. Participants go directly into the championships, so there is an additional week allowed for swimming if that amendment passes. It would urge the passage of that amendment.

Option No. 2 is Proposal 32. It was prepared by the steering committee in response to Resolution No. 117 passed in the 1991. Convention. It is characterized, although this varies, by roughly a 165 week playing season, the establishment of specific starting dates rather than those determined from counting back from championships and the elimination of the nontraditional seasons with the exception of tennis and golf.

Option No. 3 represents a number of proposals that range from Proposal 92 through 108. These proposals have been presented by a variety of membership constituencies. I believe they will be defined on the floor as we proceed with legislation.

Option No. 4 is Proposal 33, which has been titled a "cleanup, proposal" of the 1991 legislation. I believe it is quite necessary if either. Proposals 31 or 32 fails. It replaces a specific starting date with the first Friday after Labor Day, so that it goes by calendar rather than a specific date. You therefore have some annual consistency. It suggests that in the nontraditional season you may only practice four days. Withour current legislation, which is incomplete, we can practice seven days in the nontraditional season and only six in the traditional.

Let me complete my comments with one warning. To do nothing, would be to live with incomplete legislation. We have to make a choice and that choice is up to you. The steering committee is simply trying to put forward all of the options.

Thank you for your attention. I hope I have helped to simplify and place in perspective what is before you. I know you will vote for what is best for your respective institutions, for your student-athletes, for Division III. I must say in listening to Dick Schultz's comments yesterday, I feel blessed to be a part of Division III. And while I am sobered by the road ahead, I believe in both the integrity and the work ethic of this group.

I want to in closing thank Rocco. I will join Dave and Dennis in that and tell you that he has kept the steering committee on track and that he has kept us laughing. So we thank him.

Mr. Carzo: Jen would be available to answer any questions about the three options.

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): I wonder if you might

168 ________ 1992 Convention Proceedings

talk a little bit more about the "clock is running" concept with respect to Proposal No. 31. I think we need to be clear about the implications of the phrase "the clock is running" as it relates to Proposal 31. I believe we have differing and numerous interpretations of what No. 31 will mean for each of our institutions. Perhaps she could say a few more words about that and spark a question or two by institution or by conference. Depending on how the discussion goes, we may want to have a caucus by conference. It largely will depend on the line of questions.

Ms. Shillingford: The "clock is running" concept means that in a sport—let's take swimming—that you would start counting back 18 weeks from the championships. You actually have 19 weeks. You have 18 weeks to take out of the 19, so you actually get relief at that holiday break of one week.

At the present time, you are able to take out your holiday weeks. The reason this has been an area of confusion is that the steering committee wondered if it could be interpreted the other way. That is a possibility. I think we felt that to clarify the proposal for you we had to bring to you what was on paper. You may vote either way on it. But I think we needed to be honest because what could happen is that we could vote for the 21-week rule within this 18- or 19-week concept and throw it to the Interpretations Committee. But we do not have a guarantee of how that would be interpreted. So the steering committee thought that the most honest approach to this would be to give you what actually is in your program.

The amendment for swimming would then take it to 20.

John D. Galaris (Salem State College): I am not sure I understood what you said about the 18 or 19 weeks falling within the 21-week concept.

Ms. Shillingford: I am sorry, I did not mean to confuse you. Proposal No. 31 gives you 19 weeks in which to take 18, but you must count back from the championship and the clock is always running. So basically, you can take one week of your holiday break out of that. I was just drawing a comparison. It is not 21. It is 18 out of 19. Is that clear?

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: I would just slike to ask a question on that. So if you have your basketball championship at the end of March you count back 19 weeks; and if you take two weeks off during the Christmas break, the clock continues to runduring that period?

Ms. Shillingford: One of the two weeks.

Mr. Schael: One of the two weeks only?

Ms. Shillingford: Right. Eighteen out of 19.

Mr. Schael: So if you are off three weeks during that...

Ms. Shillingford: Two of them count.

Mr. Schael: Two of them count?

Ms. Shillingford: That is correct.

Mr. Schael: Thank you.

Ms. Shillingford: That is, I think, as clear as we can make it.
Mr. Carzo: It has been suggested that this would be an appropriate

		
Division III Business Session		14

time for a break so that you may visit with your conferences or your colleagues.

[The meeting was recessed for 30 minutes.]

REPORTS

Mr. Carzo: We would like to resume this session with a report from the Presidents Commission from Dave Warren of Ohio Wesleyan University.

Presidents Commission

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): I hope your caucus, was helpful in reflecting on prior presentations. My report will be brief in behalf of the Presidents Commission. As I have in the previous two years, let me just reference the authority under which the Presidents Commission operates and also make note of those who are its members.

In my pocket version of NCAA rules and regulations there is a section about the responsibilities of the Commission. Let me just cite a couple because I think they are clearly in play at this Convention. The duties and responsibilities include reviewing any activity of the Association, placing any matter of concern on the agenda, commissioning studies that the Commission feels appropriate, proposing legislation, and establishing the sequence of legislation so that we can vote on items of common cause together and in an order that is in the best interests of the Association.

In your blue book you will find a listing of the 44 Commission members. I would ask at this time if current Division III members of the Commission would rise just so that you will know where to aim your slings and arrows.

My report is in two parts and I hope brief. The first refocuses on the reform agenda that has been before the Association over the last several years. You will hear for the balance of this Convention a certain mantra that has three phrases to it: cost reduction, time savings in playing and practice seasons, reduced number of missed classes for students.

If we do it right and if we do it well, those are the objectives we hope to accomplish in all of the legislation in the reform package.

Proposal No. 39, which we adopted last year, had those underlying goals. Today we are going to talk about three proposals that are intended to clarify. There may be some disagreement as to whether any clarification emerges, but Proposals 31, 32 and 33 are intended to clarify and strengthen the reform proposal. When we get to the debate on Proposals 31, 32 and 33, until there is a new caucus and vote taken by the Presidents Commission, the Commission continues to support Proposal 31 on the belief that it, more than the other two, will bring about cost reduction, time savings and reduced number of missed classes. It is not perfect. I am certain that if it is adopted it would require some further modification in future legislation. But as the best template for reform, the Commission still believes Proposal No. 31 is the vote you should cast. A lot more will be said about that before this day is over.

170	92 Convention	Proceedings
-----	---------------	-------------

The other piece of legislation of special interest to the Commission is Proposal No. 34. That is the creation of a Division I-AAA football classification. I would strongly urge your support of Division I-AAA. Those who were present last year will recall a lengthy and spirited debate on the question should a Division I team be able to play down to Division III in football. This division and Divisions I and II both adopted the proposition that no longer should a Division I school play down into a Division III championship. What we need to do at this Convention is create a home for those homeless teams who are now in Division I and need a place for their championship to reside. Proposal No. 34 would provide that.

The other aspect of my report has to do primarily with Divisions I and Hissues, which Division III commissioners do have a chance to debate and do have a chance to vote on. As is often the case, much of the media attention is focused on those Divisions I and II questions, in particular the academic reforms embedded in Proposals 14, 15 and 16.

These very important reforms aim to raise the grade-point average from 2.000 to 2.500, aim to increase the number of core courses required from 11 to 13 and to create an index. I believe Division III commissioners have properly reflected your interests in our support of these reforms and in particular, in holding the line on 700 SATs as the absolute and bare minimum that would be appropriate for a Division I student to qualify for a full scholarship in his or her freshman year.

We also have been involved in discussions with respect to compensation for coaches. I have not heard of any of our Division III coaches suffering from overpayment. However, there is a provision that you want to take note of which would involve a review before the acceptance of a contract by any Division III coach by the institution. It probably is improforma for us, but it is certainly structural and strategic for Divisions I and II. We, as your commissioners, have supported the prior approval by the chief administrative officer of the institution for Division I coaches to have contracts outside of their institutional contracts.

We also have been deeply involved in discussions about strategic planning. You will hear more about Proposals 35 and 36 when we go into the full gathering of all divisions. They have to do with presidential authority, financial control and institutional integrity. They are consistent with the Knight Commission and extraordinarily important, it think, to preserving and protecting the good name of Division III.

I said to Father Ted Hesberg when he presented the report from the Knight Commission that there was only one thing missing in that report as far as I was concerned. The report dealt with financial integrity, presidential authority and institutional control of athletics. I said "You did not mention that there was an operative model out there. It is called Division III."

What often happens is that the rhetoric of Division III is adopted by Division I. We both have the rhetoric and the reality of presidential control, institutional integrity and financial constraint. And I hope that we will more and more have recognition from our Divisions I and II

Division III Business Session	171

colleagues as well as the Knight Commission.

Finally, there are some matters that Congress has on its agenda that will bear on us. One has to do with the Henry bill, which would require every NCAA institution to report by sport revenue generated and expended. There will be a resolution before the entire body to discourage Congress from accepting that particular provision of the Henry bill! Your representatives on the Commission have already voted unanimously against such a provision.

There is the question of institutional certification versus selfevaluation. We are self-evaluating institutions in Division III. The Knight Commission has called for a certification model. Your representatives have said that a certification model is appropriate for Divisions I and II, but not for Division III. Thus far, that distinction has been

Finally and parenthetically, let me suggest that as the debate unfolds today and tomorrow, especially on Proposals 31, 32 and 33, information that may not have been known by you as delegates may well come to your attention. Interpretations that were heretofore unknown may come to your attention. And it may, in all candor, change your mind about the commitment that your institution has already made with respect to a particular provision. If that is so, I would urge those of you who come with the commitment already upon you-if you are an athletics director or a faculty rep on behalf of your institution to call your president and say as a result of the following I think we need to change our vote on Proposal X.

I would not wish you to either violate your president's instruction or fracture your conscience. It seems to me the remedy to that is to consult $\hat{\ }$ if new and compelling information is before you. The Commission has worked hard to represent what we hope to be your goals, your objectives "c and your ideals. What we will see in the course of the next several hours is that we can differently interpret those. It is not simple. It is often going to put institutions from one region in conflict with those from another, institutions with one academic calendar in conflict with another, and perhaps the basic underlying philosophy of what is a major and a minor sport in conflict one with another.

I trust that we will proceed through this debate with as much candor and forthrightness as possible and that in the end we will vote in a way : that is finally and ultimately in the interests of the student-athlete.

WAIVERS

[NOTE: The Division III business session heard petitions for waivers of Division III membership criteria from College Misericor: dia, Hendrix College, Jarvis Christian College, Savannah College of Art and Design, Southwestern University, Trinity University (Texas) and Westminster College. The petitions were approved.]

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

 $[NOTE: The \ slate for \ Division \ III \ representatives \ to \ the \ Council \ and$ Division III vice-president's position was approved as presented.]

______1992 Convention Proceedings 172

.[The meeting was recessed for 10 minutes.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

[NOTE: Voting instructions were given.]

Mr. Carzo: We want to proceed to the voting. Let me remind you that the chair will not interpret; that each sponsor will clarify his position on the floor, and if there is help needed from the legislative assistant or the parliamentarian, you may direct your questions to them.

[NOTE: A motion to reorder the agenda to consider Proposal No. 98 after Proposal No. 32 and before Proposal No. 31 was seconded but

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons

William E. Lide (Salisbury State University): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No.

[The motion was seconded.]

The steering committee is sponsoring this proposal to fulfill the requirements of 1991 Convention Proposal No. 117, which was a resolution requiring the steering committee to sponsor legislation to decrease the length of the Division III playing season and to eliminate split seasons in sports other than men's golf and tennis.

According to the sponsors of the 1991 Convention Proposal No. 117, elimination of split seasons minimizes missed class time due to competition and provides greater opportunity for the student-athlete to pursue other educational interests during the off-season. The sponsors also believe that the establishment of uniform dates for starting and concluding the playing season will result in a cost saving and will further enhance the principle of competitive equity and the Division III statement of philosophy, which indicates that primary emphasis is given to in-season competition.

In conclusion, the general characteristics of this proposal as a viable coption are: to decrease the length of the playing and practice season by eliminating the split segments of traditional and nontraditional; having only a traditional segment in each sport except tennis and men's golf, and a specified starting date for practice and competition for each sport conducted during the fall, winter and spring seasons.

It reduces the number of contests by eliminating the nontraditional segment and contests within it. A conclusion of the NCAA championship in this proposal in each sport concludes all practice and competition for

Tim Brown (Skidmore College): I move Proposal No. 32-1. [The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to revise the starting dates for practice and competition in the sports of tennis and men's golf when the traditional playing segment is in the fall. This amendment allows a starting date of September 1 or the first day of classes for the nontraditional season. Proposal No. 32 states the first day of classes as the starting date. The first day of classes may range in various institutions from August 15 to September 15. This is an inconsistent

Division III Business Session ____

starting date, unlike the other starting dates in this legislation of November 1 for the winter teams and February 1 for the spring teams

The fall season in the North due to the weather finishes somewhere in the middle of October. The weather determines our finishing date. It would ask that the legislation not determine so strictly our starting date. It would take two weeks away, depending upon the individual institution's academic calendars. We voted for a September 1 or first day of classes starting date in 1988 at Nashville. Last year, when Proposal No. 39 was passed, we had a starting date for the nontraditional seasons as September 1 or the first day of classes.

I think that the legislation stating the first day of classes is an oversight and not an intention of the Division III Steering Committee. The historical overview given earlier referred to a level playing field. If think that the proposed legislation does not give us a level playing field. But the amendment does. I urge your support of this amendment.

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): I would urge defeated of both Proposals 32 and 32-1. That would be the position of the Commission.

[Proposal No. 32-1 (Page A-42) was defeated by Division III, 113-7, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

John S. Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University): I rise to provide support for Proposal No. 32 and also to provide some clarification.

Proposal 32 is a direct result of the support from this group in last year's Convention under Resolution 117. Also, I think it is important to point out that the essence of Proposal 32 is the elimination of the nontraditional playing season. Because of the conflict with facilities human resources and to provide the student-athlete with an opportunity to be involved in a multiple number of sports during the academic year Proposal 32 was put forth.

Proposal 32 also was reordered because it was deemed more restrictive. But I think that those who are concerned about the restrictions in Proposal 31 on winter sports might take a second look at Proposal No. 32 because in many years it will provide longer practice and playing seasons than No. 31 might, particularly those who are advocating for greater length of time in the swimming season in some years than is provided in No. 32.

It also provides common starting dates in a clear way, which is in the spirit of deregulation.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): I would like to ask President Warren and the Presidents Commission to tell me the rationale in why they opposed Proposal No. 32. We talk about how we are the model for the Knight Commission and we want to save money. Why would you oppose No. 32?

Mr. Warren: I am going to defer that question to the president of the NCAA, Miss Judy Sweet.

I would be happy to respond, but I am reflecting the reports coming from both the steering committee and the Commission. I will comment on that, but I would like to ask Judy if she would come forward and

174 ________ 1992 Convention Proceedings

comment first.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): I cannot speak on behalf of the Presidents Commission, but I would like to share some of my reflections on how we got to where we are today and the different options that are before us and why I personally feel that Proposal No. 32 is too dramatic of a change.

I had the responsibility of presiding over the special Convention in Dallas several years ago that first started to define playing and practice issues as a lot of displeasure with the regulations that were being proposed, which were going from no restrictions to a 21-week playing and practice season. At that time, the steering committee heard specifically from the membership that it would like to have institutional autonomy within whatever that definition of playing and practice seasons was going to be.

We heard about the differences in academic calendars. We heard about the differences in geographical location and climatic conditions. As a result, what we heard from the Division III membership at that time was we are willing to try imposing playing and practice season limitations, but please give us some flexibility to determine what is going to work best on our individual campuses.

As I look at Proposal No. 32 specifically, I reflect on the North Coast Athletic Conference survey, and I commend them on the excellent work that they have done. The information they shared with us suggests that the student-athletes in Division III are not under the same time pressures as the student-athletes in Division I and Division II.

Was before us last year was a result of recommendations from a special committee on cost reduction. As we reviewed the legislation last year, we determined that what was being proposed in Proposal 39 last year would allow for some cost reduction to take place, but that there was some refinement that needed to be done in that proposal. The steering committee was charged with coming up with ways to refine what was before you last year. In fact, there was an amendment-to-amendment that delayed the implementation date so that that refinement could coccur. Last year, there also was Resolution No. 117 to bring back to you specific starting dates, and that is Proposal No. 32.

I believe that as the Division III Steering Committee evaluated what had been approved last year that would go into effect this August and looked at what was mandated by the resolution, it felt that perhaps the two proposals were too different and that there needed to be something in the middle. My personal feeling is that we now have too many choices before us. In the opening remarks this morning, it was emphasized that one of the tenets of Division III is to focus on the Division III philosophy and to keep things simple and easy to understand. At this point in time, I am not sure that we have honored those principles.

If there was documentation that there was too much pressure on our student-athletes, that all of the institutions wanted to go to fixed dates consistent throughout the country and that there would be significant

cost reductions, I believe that Proposal No. 32 would be worthy of your consideration. But I don't believe that that is the case right now.

Again, I cannot speak for the Presidents Commission. I don't know that I have articulated why it is opposed to the proposal. But as a representative of the University of California, San Diego, those are our feelings.

Mr. Bogan: I still would like to hear from the presidents.

Mr. Warren: There is no doubt in our mind that you would enjoy some cost reductions. I can summarize Judy's remarks by saying we think it would be an unfair and unreasonable limitation on the participation factor for students in far too many schools. It is important and necessary to have nontraditional seasons for cause of geography and for cause of scheduling. In summary, the Presidents Commission felt that this was too Draconian of a measure and believed that Proposal No. 31 is the best balance in dealing with cost reductions, the best balance taking into consideration matters of time constraints on students and the best balance in terms of having them miss fewer classes.

If it were a one-dimensional proposal only, I grant you No. 32 would be the best cost-reducer.

Mr. Bogan: I appreciate that President Warren. I just feel that maybe Proposal No. 32 is not the answer for everything. Maybe we can fine-tune it.

I agree with Judy. I think we have too much there. I just hope the body really looks at Proposal No. 32. It is simple. It is clean. I think we need that now if we really want to follow what has been put before us for integrity.

We have to start somewhere. Maybe we should start with Proposal No. 32.

Rayla Allison (National Softball Coaches Association): I stand before you representing the concerns, wishes and needs of Division III softball coaches who have expressed opposition to Proposal No. 32.

The coaches association urges this group to support Proposal 31 for the reasons that have previously been stated and oppose Proposal No. 32.

[Proposal No. 32 (Page A-39) was defeated by Division III, 41-211, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons

John H. Harvey (Carnegie Mellon University): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

The steering committee believes this proposal provides a middle ground and a moderate position in furthering aspects of reform begun last year.

For example, it reduces from 21 to 18 the number of weeks for the practice and playing seasons. As most of you know, 21 weeks has proved to be more than necessary for most sports to have a satisfactory season.

176 ______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

I would like to point out that all of the details in this proposal are contained in your Convention Official Notice in Appendix C and also on Page 2 of the pink sheets that were given out this morning. One significant interpretation that was made yesterday that may alter how some of you were understanding the proposal was talked about earlier.

In establishing a starting date for the practice and playing season, the proposal counts back 19 weeks from the first round of postseason playoffs or the first date of Division III championships. The interpretation is that those weeks must be counted continuously. The clock starts

and it continues running, so it is 19 straight weeks.

One other provision of this proposal makes it different from Proposal No. 32 or from what we established last year in No. 39. This deals with the split season of sports such as baseball, golf or tennis that customarily have activity in both fall and spring. Under this proposal, all sports have a total of 18 weeks to work with in their two split segments. A team in that sport may play three weeks in the fall, 15 in the spring, six in the fall, 12 in the spring, however you would like to split it.

This allows flexibility among institutions to meet various differences—weather, geography, the availability of coaches and training staff and other differences. We believe the flexibility is an important aspect of this proposal. In looking at how Division III wants to handle playing and practice seasons, I think we have at least two clear and

major possibilities at this point.

moderate Proposal No. 32. We could now go to the more moderate Proposal No. 31 currently before us or stay with the provisions of last year's Proposal No. 39, which goes into effect this coming August. You should decide which is more important and appropriate for Division III. I think we have debated and talked a great deal about the pros and cons of these two proposals. You can either stay with the policies already established and set to go into effect in August or move on to the next steps of reform proposed in Proposal 31 as amended. I would urge the approval and the support of No. 31 as it stands.

[NOTE: A motion to consider Sections A through E separately was seconded but failed.]

Tim Brown (Skidmore College): I move Proposal No. 31-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to establish September 1 or the first day of classes as the first permissible day for preseason practice or competition during the nontraditional segment for the spring sports.

I won't go through all of the rationale that I did for the last amendment. I would just remind you that this is because of the differences in institutional calendars. I will also tell you that Division I adopted this legislation last year. As a result, at one of the fine tournaments in the Northeast, the traditional tournament at West Point, there were some Division I institutions not able to participate in that tournament this year because they had not started school. Last year we amended Proposal No. 39, which allowed us the date of

Division III Business Session	17	7	,
-------------------------------	----	---	---

September 1 instead of the first day of classes at the Division III level? I would ask for your support in that exact same amendment this year? I am not positive, but I think that the Presidents Commission supported that amendment last year.

President Warren may remember, but I would also ask if they have discussed this and have a position on that amendment.

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 31-1.

This amendment has the potential to expand the playing and appractice seasons contemplated in Proposal No. 31 by designating September 1 or the first day of classes, whichever comes first, as the first day of practice and competition for the nontraditional segment. By adding "whichever occurs first," institutions with late academic years could potentially bring their athletes back for practice and/or competition as early as four weeks prior to the beginning of classes.

This would increase the cost to institutions. I urge the defeat of Proposal No. 31-1.

Thomas Weingartner (University of Chicago): We begin classes? October 5 for our fall quarter. I would urge your support of this proposal.

Mr. Brown: The next to last speaker said four weeks. That four weeks would mean if classes started September 15, that they would come back August 15. This legislation would not permit that.

Mr. Jacobs: No. It was intended for the schools that are starting later in September in that they could have the opportunity, even if they did not want to, to bring back students September 1. They would be forced with their competition possibly to bring athletes in early as opposed to the gentleman who started October 15.

I could see a problem there. But if you started somewhere in September, you would have the opportunity to move September 1 as the date that you start supplying costs for food and lodging for athletes.

Mr. Brown: The problem in the Northeast is that our season culminates with the ECAC championships in the middle of October. If we cannot start until the middle to the end of September, we are looking at maybe three weeks of competition. Some of the real quality traditional tournaments in the Northeast are played before September 15.

We are not looking to add more time. Mother Nature tells us about October 15 we are not going to play anymore in northern New York unless you are going to play in possible snow or wear gloves and hats. We are just asking to be able to play in September instead of the end of October because we cannot play in October.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): If Proposal No. 31-1 passes and amends No. 31, there will be a potential that the nontraditional season at many schools will start before the traditional season. I feel that is wrong. I urge that we oppose this amendment.

[Proposal No. 31-1 (Page A-38) was defeated by Division III, 89-161, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

John H. Harvey (Carnegie Mellon University): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 31-2.

The motion was seconded.

This concerns the extension for swimming. Proposal No. 31-2 allows the sport of swimming to count back 20 weeks instead of 19 from the Division III championships in order to determine the permissible starting date for practice. The swimming championships occur later in the season than any of our other winter sports. Therefore, the steering committee urges your support on Proposal 31-2 to give swimming the alleviation of that one week.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I would like to ask John a question about this amendment.

If the interpretation of the 20 weeks would be similar to what Jen mentioned this morning, with no relief for time spent between semesters or during exam periods or over vacation periods, would it be 20 weeks from start to finish with no breaks?

Mr. Harvey: As I understand it, that is correct. The interpretation made yesterday means once the clock starts running it keeps running. So swimming gets 20 weeks, not 13, not 19. It is 20 straight weeks. Regardless of time you take off at Christmas, it is a straight 20-week count back.

Gregory L. Lockard (Montclair State College): I would like to thank you for listening to the college coaches group.

As the executive director of the College Swimming Coaches Association of America, I will say this is very important. I would like to point out that without this last year we would count back from the conference championship. In swimming, that is often three to four weeks before the national championships. So even with this, it would effectively reduce the season by an additional three or four weeks, which in my mind is fairly unacceptable.

It is very difficult to get ready in that length of time. So this does help and we thank you for that. But overall I would say it is a very difficult become

[Proposal No. 31-2 (Page A-39) was approved by Division III, 201-37, 17 abstentions, roll-call vote.]

[The Division III business session was recessed at 12:05 p.m.]

Wednesday Afternoon, January 8, 1992

The meeting was called to order at 1:45 p.m., with Mr. Carzo presiding.

• Mr. Carzo: Will the delegates please take their seats? I apologize for getting this meeting started a few minutes late. There are a couple of technical issues that we are trying to resolve. As soon as we get those resolved, we will be able to advise you accordingly.

We have been asked a question as to whether or not we can use the window of reconsideration in this session. The answer is yes, you can request that as long as you were on the prevailing side. Because it was

vision III Business Session	17
vision III Business Session	_ 1

a negative vote, we have to do it by unanimous consent.

Richard Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): I rise to a point of order. Previously, it was stated that with regard to the interpretation of the meaning of the running clock rule, we are dealing with an interpretation. If that is so, I would like to challenge that interpretation on the floor. If that is not so, and it is my understanding from speaking with people on the dais that we are not dealing with a formal interpretation, I would move that this body go on record as stating its preference that under the existing legislation the interpretation of the running clock is one such that the clock does in fact stop. And absent any explicit direction in the proposed legislation that it should stop, the existing precedent remain in effect and that the clock in counting weeks should stop for periods when the institution is on vacation or between terms.

Mr. Carzo: Let's go back to the first part. Dick questioned whether or not the running clock was an interpretation. No, that was not a formal interpretation. That was the way the legislation was intended to be written.

The second part is whether or not you can ask this body to recommend to the interpretations people that the clock be stopped during vacation periods, as precedented in the present 21-week rule?

Mr. Rasmussen: Yes.

Mr. Carzo: You can ask the body to do that and it will be put to a majority vote. This is a very sensitive issue. It is critical to what these people are trying to achieve. It affects all of us intimately in terms of the application of any future actions if this legislation passes.

Mr. Rasmussen: I move that this body go on record as recommending to the Interpretations Committee, the steering committee and the Council that under the existing legislation with regard to the 21-week seasons we do in fact stop the clock.

[The motion was seconded.]

We do not count weeks during which the institution is on vacation or between terms; and that absent any explicit direction in the proposed legislation, we believe that precedent should remain in effect so we indeed shall stop the clock. The clock shall not run continuously.

Mr. Carzo: You are speaking only of the winter season?

Mr. Rasmussen: It is our belief that this issue is predominantly a winter season.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): I have a question. The answer to are we only talking about the winter sports was "predominantly." I am not sure what predominantly means.

Are we only talking about the winter sports? Is there any potential that the spring sports might be in a similar set of circumstances given that they have by definition 18 weeks within the 19-week time period and there potentially could be a spring break in there?

Mr. Rasmussen: I stand corrected. The situation should remain the same as it is under the existing legislation—seven days during which practice and competition does not take place, and that would cover

0 1992 Convention Proceedings

spring sports also.

Ms. Sweet: And I believe that there could be the potential of the fall sports during their nontraditional season having the same set of circumstances. So if I understand what you are saying now, you would like it to apply as currently exists?

/ Mr. Rasmussen: As currently exists unless someone would like to amend my motion as such.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): You are telling me if the college is closed, the clock is stopped?

Mr. Rasmussen: If you are not practicing.

Mr. Bogan: Wait a minute.

Mr. Rasmussen: As it is under the existing legislation, if your team does not practice for a seven-day period you do not have to count that week currently. We want to continue following the same precedent; the precedent that is in existence right now.

Mr. Bogan: So you are saying that during that vacation period as long as you don't practice the clock is stopped?

Mr. Rasmussen: Yes

. Mr. Bogan: I think that has to be clear because some people have five to six weeks off during Christmas. They may come back and I don't want it to be interpreted that because classes are not in session the clock is stopped.

Mr. Rasmussen: Forgive me if I am not clear on that. I am stating that the interpretation would follow the existing precedent. We would count weeks in the same manner in which we count weeks now.

Gary N. Wodder (University of Scranton): I have my NCAA planner in hand and I am able at our institution to count between Christmas break, Thanksgiving break, intersession break and even periods of time that might be considered vacations when people cannot practice, let's say finals time, and I can find our winter sports team starting practice as early as the third week in September by adding up all these weeks. So I assume there are a number of institutions that would be in the same place. I think this is ill-advised to reconsider this at this time.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): It is my understanding that you can only have one break with two segments in the present legislation of 21 weeks. So I am not sure how the previous speaker's comments would apply if you can only have one break outside of the traditional.

I also am a bit confused about why a running clock is so important. If you are not supposed to be practicing outside of the 18, 19 or 20 weeks and if they take a week off or two weeks off or three weeks off—and in our case we are out of school for six weeks during Thanksgiving and New Year's—they still only get 18 weeks. So I guess I am a little confused as to why that becomes such an important point.

What we are trying to do is limit the number of weeks they can practice. If that is what we are doing, it does not matter whether or not the clock is continuous.

Joel Thirer (State University of New York at Binghamton): I am a

Division III Business Session	18	3

little bit confused about the proposal as to how it applies to basketball. With the starting date for basketball being November 1, would this proposal affect that starting date?

John H. Harvey (Carnegie Mellon University): Yes. In the sport of basketball, any of the other winter sports, it is still an 18-week span. I also think Walter is correct in his interpretation regardless of what sport.

The idea was to make the consistency that we are talking about and have an 18-week participation span. That would apply to basketball, and the other sports. If you have two segments to that, before and after Christmas, it still can add up to 18 weeks. That would be basketball, with swimming, whatever.

Ms. Sweet: It seems as though the operative word is confused. It would like to try to answer the question Walter asked in regard to why we are concerned with the starting date and what I understand based on discussions that I have had with the steering committee. It may be why we are experiencing confusion.

Proposal No. 31 takes into account three different ways of determining your playing and practice season. There is one for the fall sports that, addresses practice opportunities. There is one for the winter sports, which is the 18 within 19. I believe that is the one that some people on the steering committee were hoping would allow for the determination of a starting date.

That is what led to having the running clock and not applying the same principle as the 21 weeks. When you move to the spring sports, vou have a designated February 1 starting date.

We repeatedly have heard that we want consistency. Personally, I am having a hard time figuring out how we are defining consistency. There are lots of different ways to define consistency. Last year we voted on some legislation that we were going to try to perfect this year. We have not even lived with that legislation. Now we are changing it. I think that that is adding to the confusion that we are all experiencing here. I am not certain how we get out of this situation, but I do think that we are going to add to the confusion if we continue to try to interpret and change interpretations and change intent. Perhaps we need to focus on what is it that we really want to accomplish. I would suggest that it would be in our best interests if we can define if we are trying to designate a specific number of weeks. Are we trying to determine specific starting dates? Are we trying to determine practice opportunities? Are we trying to determine national starting dates or are we trying to do all of those things?

If we are trying to do all of those things, I am not certain that we are ever going to get this resolved.

Mr. Carzo: I have been trying not to respond to this thing and it is really killing me. I don't see it as complicated as you are all making it.

What you are trying to do is make Proposal No. 31 as much like No. 32 in the winter season as possible. The question is whether or not those two add to the confusion. Proposal No. 31 was originally designed to be

the middle of the road—21, 18 and 16—with obvious constraints offered for all three options. We said that if we mixed and matched, we would cause some problems.

We indeed are trying to mix and match. We want to respond to what your concerns are. However, it was not the will of this body to split Proposal No. 31 by voting to divide it. So now we are looking for another mechanism to handle the problem. That is okay as long as it is legally possible. If it is possible, then you will decide which way you want to go no this issue. That to me is where we are at this point. If Armin says that we can go ahead with it—he is the parliamentarian—we will go ahead and vote as to whether or not we can do what Dick has asked us to do.

If not, we are right back where we were. You have No. 31 before you as amended, and we will vote on it in its entirety.

Armin P. Langholz (Capital University): The motion was made with an understanding of the interpretation, if you were to pass it with that understanding there is no guarantee that the Interpretations Committee would agree with what you are asking for. If it was to say no, the intent was or is, then you would have to live with whatever you passed until the next Convention.

Mr. Carzo: I just want to make sure that issue is clear. If you vote to do what you are doing, there is no guarantee it is going to change anything. And Proposal No. 31 will be passed exactly the way you junderstand it now with a running time clock.

Mr. Rasmussen: If the motion is passed, there is a clear statement from the entire body, not just the sponsors of the legislation, but the entire division to which this is going to apply as to what their preference for the intent should be.

"F' Granted, the Interpretations Committee may differ with that. The strain of the str

Mr. Carzo: I just want to make sure that is clear to everybody. Dick, we need one more clarification from your recommendation. How does this affect, as you see it, spring and fall sports?

Mr. Rasmussen: The intent of my motion is that the effect on fall, winter and spring sports would be exactly the same as it is currently.

Mr. Carzo: Exactly the way it is currently in the legislation that we are trying to have interpreted?

. Mr. Rasmussen: No. Counting for fall, winter and spring sports would be done under Proposal No. 31 in exactly the same manner as it is done now under the existing 21-week rule.

Nancy L. Mitchell (NCAA): I want to make sure if the Interpretations Committee looks at this that it has a clear understanding, if it gets that far, of what it is supposed to be looking at.

In Proposal No. 31, for fall sports, if the start of the practice and playing season is tied to practice opportunities, like 19 practice

182		1992	Convention	Proceeding
	 	1772	Convention	rioceeum

opportunities back, which some of the fall sports are, then would that week off or two weeks off or three weeks off also apply to the start of that practice and playing season?

Mr. Rasmussen: It would apply the same way it does now. For example, the way in which we are counting practice opportunities for

football right now does not affect it there.

Ms. Mitchell: Okay. So it would be like it is now where you have a specific starting date for practice based on practice opportunities. You figure what that is and then within that you have a number of weeks and within those weeks you can take time off, and you are still fine. But it does not push back that starting date?

Mr. Rasmussen: In the case of the fall sports.

Ms. Mitchell: Right. I think that helped me. Thank you.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I think Judy was right on the money before. I would like to try to fill in something

that might be helpful.

Earlier in the morning, John Harvey made a comment that having defeated Proposal 32 we were left with No. 31 or last year's legislation. That is not totally accurate. There are other worthy and well-thoughtout amendments later in the program that are meant to fine-tune what we did last year. I call to your attention Nos. 98, 100 and 103. From my perspective, the concern I had leaving the Convention last year was the August 24 date and what it did to the preseason practices in soccer, volleyball, cross country and field hockey. That is addressed in one of those three pieces that comes later. I was concerned about the nontraditional seasons and number of practice opportunities there, so I think we have more than just Proposals 31, 32 and what is on the books.

We have got Proposal No. 31 that is before you. I would recommend that we defeat this because I don't think it is needed. I don't think that we have demonstrated that 21 weeks does not work. If somebody can tell me that 21 weeks is not working and there has been massive abuse of that 21-week season, I would be happy to listen. But I have not heard that. I don't want to see us get stampeded into something that will disenfranchise our Division III student-athletes and change something that is not broken. So I would like to try to move ahead and dispose of Proposal No. 31 and see if we can amend what already is on the books and fine-tune it.

Jerry H. Miller (California Lutheran University): I rise to support the notion just expressed by the previous speaker and to say that actions already in place provide for a span of time that is in excess of a semester's length of time for practice and competition in any sport on the books. To further liberalize that by approving this motion to reconsider seems to me inappropriate.

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): I just wanted to respond to the point about consistency. This, as you can imagine, has been a very difficult proposal for the steering committee to deal with. I

think in some ways it was very consistent.

1992 Convention Proceedings

You have three different starting dates being proposed. They are being proposed in a different way. In the fall, it is a date counting back from the championship and then tacking on your 18 practice opportunities. In the spring it is February 1, and unless you have a counting back from the championships, you do not have a starting date in the winter. I don't really care whether you vote yes or no.

_ I am just trying to say that that is consistency. There are starting adates. The value of having a starting date in the winter is if there is a block of time off in the holidays, Rocco can bring his winter teams in September 15 because he is going to take a long winter break. I will bring mine in November 1. If we play on the 15th, he has an advantage. So that is the strength. I am not pushing one way or the other. I am just

trying to clarify.

Louis W. Spiotti (Rochester Institute of Technology): I support what Bill Marshall mentioned. There is other legislation coming up later in the agenda. There are three pieces from the Empire Athletic Association-Proposal No. 95, which addresses dividing the nontraditional segments; No. 99, Division III prepractice opportunities in the *traditional segment; and No. 101, first contest or date of competition for Division III fall sports.

🐍 . It came from the membership. It is not from the Council. I think that is important. We need to note that there are very good ideas coming

from the membership. We ought to take a look at them.

Susan Petersen Lubow (U.S. Merchant Marine Academy): I also am in support of what Bill Marshall said. I urge the delegates to vote down Proposal No. 31. But my main reason for feeling that way is that

our Division III philosophy is one of participation.

If we are to assume what we were first told about the running clock. for the winter sports, specifically swimming, we will hurt our athletes in general. Starting the count back with the NCAA championships is very unfair. You are dealing with elite athletes, not your general athlete. Especially in the sport of swimming. Our conference happens to have our women's championship February 7. Their season would end that weekend of February 7. The NCAA championships are approximately March 14. They have lost a good four or five weeks of that 18. So they are left with maybe an 11- or 12-week season counting off the time for exams, etc. That is not what our Division III philosophy is all about. I'urge that we defeat Proposal No. 31 and think about the general athlete that we are dealing with.

Mr. Rasmussen: A point of clarification. The motion that we are debating on the floor has nothing to do necessarily with supporting or opposing Proposal No. 31, per se.

What it has to do with is the interpretation of the running clock such that if Proposal No. 31 is passed, this is the manner in which this body wants the clock to be interpreted.

It is not necessarily a statement in support of Proposal No. 31, but a statement of how this body perhaps would like No. 31 to be applied if it is passed.

[The motion to define the "clock is running" interpretation failed.

Mr. Carzo: We are now back to voting on Proposal No. 31:35, previously amended.

Mr. Spiotti: I am president of the Empire Athletic Association. As a conference, we have been deliberating the issue of length of season for about 10 months and have proposed several pieces of legislation. Our objective was to take a sensible look at what is really in the best interests of our student-athletes and Division III. We began with the basic assumption that what Division III has been doing is good and that the effort to restrain and reduce Division I and Division II is justified to Some adjustments are appropriate at the Division III level.

Our position as a conference is that we should not get in a reactive mode, but seek a middle ground and take a sensible approach to reform. When our athletes do not receive scholarships, where coaching compensation is modest, where game and TV revenue is for all intents and purposes negligible, what remains to be the motive to be excessive?

The Division III philosophy should be the statement of this Association adopted to its best way. Why are we behaving in this way when our athletes stood up at this time last year at this very Convention and said don't deprive us of the opportunity that we pay for? Our opinion is that Proposal No. 31 is overreacting. It is confusing and inconsistent, as we already have heard. We have legislation that is yet to be implemented. We ought to give it a chance.

As a conference, we are strongly opposed to Proposal No. 31 and urge that you vote it down. I would like to remind the membership, as I did before, that legislation is introduced later in the agenda. I refer to Proposals 95, 99 and 101. We feel these proposals reflect a more balanced, more sensible approach to practice and playing seasons.

Layton Shoemaker (Messiah College): I would like to point out that in Proposal No. 31 we have some confusing legislation that is not being accepted by the group.

What we adopted in 1991 to be effective in 1992-93 has not been given a chance to work. It divided the traditional and nontraditional segments. And although the work of the steering committee is to be commended, there are some things that it may not have taken into account that many of us are hoping would be taken into account. Proposal No. 31 is flawed in some ways by treating field hockey in a different way and putting it in a different class of citizenship. That could be rectified by the adoption of Proposal 92.

Proposal No. 31 also provides for an 18-week season, traditional and nontraditional. The difficulty is with the way the nontraditional needs to be accounted for in its consecutive-week nature. In theory, Proposal 31 would permit 28 practice and competitive opportunities if it were adopted. In actuality, Proposal No. 98 is a bit more restrictive because it would only allow 26 practice and competitive opportunities. So we could vote down Proposal 31 and adopt No. 98 and still stay within the cost-containment measures that we are looking for. The difference is that the 26 opportunities would not need to be taken within the context.

of a consecutive-week format. That is what many of us were kind of hoping for. If we did that, institutions would have a greater opportunity to be autonomous in the way that they adopt the 26 practices and the way they put them into effect on their own campuses.

Therefore, I would urge that the delegates consider defeating Proposal No. 31 and adopting No. 92 and any one of the Proposals 98 through 101 that improve on what we adopted last year.

Ms. Sweet: Mr. Chair, first off, I want to express appreciation to the steering committee and to yourself for bringing to the membership choices. I think that is what the membership asked for and that the steering committee worked very hard to provide choices.

Unfortunately, as we have identified, No. 31 has some areas that may not have been apparent in first reviewing the legislation that will have more impact on our playing and practice seasons than we originally anticipated. I think many of us thought originally that all that we were looking at was a difference between 21 weeks and 18 weeks. We found out that we are looking at the difference between a running clock and an opportunity to stop the clock. We found out that we are looking at the difference between counting back from your last competition and counting back from the start of the championship.

As a result, I think that it would be in our best interests to not pass Proposal No. 31 at this time and try getting last year's Proposal No. 39 in the shape that we are comfortable with. But I would also encourage you, Mr. Chair, to ask for a straw vote of the members here today as to whether they feel there are particular parts of the playing and practice seasons that need further refinement. I refer to the areas that I mentioned earlier.

Are we trying to reduce the number of weeks? Are we trying to determine specific practice opportunities or are we trying to determine national starting dates? Another alternative, are we trying to maintain institutional autonomy?

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): In this instance, I speak not as the chair of Division III because my words will not necessarily reflect the position, but rather as president of Ohio Wesleyan. I also rise to associate myself with remarks of Judy Sweet. I think that since the materials were mailed and this discussion today we have some new facts on the table. I think there is a new and different interpretation of what Proposal No. 31-A intended and what No. 31-B would have as its consequences. I find myself admittedly confused and distressed that what I thought we as the Commission and I as president of Ohio Wesleyan would be supporting is apparently not that package.

.-I think Judy is right. We ought to therefore draw back from Proposal No. 31. My own back-up position would be to look carefully at No. 33. Accordingly, I, not as the chair of Division III, but as president of Ohio Wesleyan, would urge the defeat of Proposal No. 31.

Katherine Marshall (Emory University, Student-Athlete Advisory

Committee): We just want to play. I realize that may be a very simplistic thing to say. But that is what we would ask. We oppose Proposal No. 31.

We would ask that you give us a chance with the 21 weeks. It will maximize participation. For us as a committee, most of the athletes do perform on an elite level in Division III. But many of our teammates stop with the conference meet or game or whatever. If we will try the 21 weeks, you will get maximum participation. It also will let the people with traditional and nontraditional segments have the most participation they can have. They can divide it up how they want. So we would ask you not to adopt Proposal No. 31.

Gloria R. Scott (Bennett College): I would like to ask the Parliamentarian or the Chair to give a clear delineation of what the status will be if Proposal No. 31 is defeated.

Are we back to the original proposal from last year? And does that mean that if we assume that we will adopt or let stand last year's proposal that we would not want to deal with the proposals in the 90s? Is that correct?

Mr. Carzo: You could still deal with the 90s, yes. That is correct. If Proposal No. 31 fails, we are back to where we were last year. Then you go to the next proposal that helps the present circumstances unamended.

The question is called. Sorry about that. But I have also been asked to take some straw votes. I am not interested in taking straw votes because I think it is impossible to determine anything from straw votes. We learned that last year to a very sobering degree by asking questions about what our mandates were.

Also, I would like to say that the five or six components that you asked us to integrate with those straw votes are impossible to integrate to any degree of satisfaction. We brought those to you. They are before you now. You have the three options. They are exactly what you asked for. I think it is time we voted on the issue.

[Proposal No. 31 (Page A-35) was defeated by Division III, 36-216, three abstentions, roll-call vote, as amended by No. 31-2.]

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons

Dolores A. Bogard (State University College at Cortland): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 33.

[The motion was seconded.]

With our defeat of Proposals 31 and 32, we are now left with our reform measure of last year, which is a 21-week limit on playing and practice seasons.

However, if you recall there are some inconsistencies in that legislation that must be rectified. Proposal 33 clarifies our legislation in, three ways. First, it establishes the Friday following Labor Day as the first permissible contest date in all sports except basketball, football, and ice hockey. Second, it limits the countable athletically related activities to four days a week during the nontraditional segment. Third, it applies the missed class time regulation adopted last year for the

traditional segment to the nontraditional segment.

Proposal No. 33 makes last year's actions sensible, practical and consistent. The steering committee believes that the legislation is necessary. I strongly urge your support.

Tim Brown (Skidmore College): I would like to move Proposal No. 33-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

I do this with some small degree of hope. The intent is to specify that the first contest or date of competition during the nontraditional segment for each sport except basketball, football and ice hockey shall be September 1 or the first day of classes. We have hosted a golf tournament the Wednesday after Labor Day in the past. As I looked at my dates, one of my distinguished colleagues pointed out to me at lunch that we could still host it, we just could not play in it. Another colleague from Susquehanna, Don Harnum, indicated that would be solving our problems as management for labor because we could use our golf team to help conduct the tournament. But I would hope that you would allow schools whose calendars start later than others to play those who are already in session or whose calendars have started earlier.

We just want a date start. Even if we have a change in our times if our calendar were to change. There are a number of other schools that will

We want that consistency that I think Jen was up here talking about 10 minutes ago. We just want a starting date that will allow us to participate with other schools that are already in session.

Thomas Weingartner (University of Chicago): Again, we would ask your support on this proposal. We are on the quarter system. We begin classes October 5, which would effectively rule out nontraditional fall participation in sports like tennis. We urge you to seriously consider this.

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: I rise also in support of Proposal No. 33-1. I think the student-athlete who got up and talked just a few minutes ago really made a strong point. The students want to play the game. They want to have the opportunity to practice.

To deny institutions that are on a quarter system the opportunity to have a nontraditional season seems to be contradictory to what we are all about in Division III. We ought to provide opportunities and give them all the assistance that we can.

[Proposal No. 33-1 (Page A-44) was approved by Division III, 181-72, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I would like to move that Proposal No. 33 be divided into Parts A, B and C for consideration.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

May I ask for an interpretation? If A is defeated, could we begin practice or competition August 24, which would allow the institution to decide how many dates or when it started competition rather than an arbitrary date of Friday after Labor Day? I am talking about the

traditional segment.

Mr. Carzo: That is correct. You would be left with a starting date of August 24. That was the question.

Mr. Gordon: The institution could then decide when its first competition was any time after that date?

Mr. Carzo: Yes.

Mr. Gordon: Thank you.

Everett J. Phillips (State University College at Fredonia): I speak in opposition and suggest the group vote down Part A.

For a number of years, many of us have played soccer tournaments, etc., on Labor Day weekend in which we do not have classes. The students lose no class time. If we left this intact, those dates go out the window.

[Part A of Proposal No. 33 (Page A-43) was defeated by Division III, 72-182, one abstention, roll-call vote, as amended by No. 33-1.]

Nathan N. Salant (Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic. Conference): I rise to speak against Part B, not because I am opposed to limiting the nontraditional season, but because I firmly believe that Proposal No. 98 does a better job of it.

No. 98 puts everyone on an equal footing with a limit of 26 contest dates while leaving institutions the flexibility of dealing with midsemester breaks, holidays, facility limitations, etc.

It also more than likely constricts the amount of time that would be used in a nontraditional season. For example, if a school used 15 weeks in the spring for a baseball or softball program and were left with six weeks for nontraditional, it could then conceivably with the four-perweek limitation spread it over a six-week period. It is more likely that with the 26-opportunity limitation that you would compress the time and your season a little bit, thereby solving some of the problems that may exist in terms of facilities, limitations, overlapping extra months and these types of things.

I also would like to point out that our conference, the Middle Atlantic. Conference, acting totally independently from another conference, the Empire Conference, came up with almost identical proposals in this area as well as one or two others. I think that that also should be taken into consideration as a reflection of a broad base within Division III that apparently might not have gotten to some of the folks out there.

Again, I ask that you take a good look at Proposal No. 98. I also ask that you take a good look at some of the proposals that come later on as better solutions to this problem.

Norman A. Sundstrom (Allegheny College): I would like to support, what the gentleman just said relative to Proposal 33-B. Many of the schools in the Northeast really refer to their spring sports as split seasons.

We consider the fall just as important as the spring. I think allowing us to have the 26 opportunities, as designated in Proposal No. 98,5 provides us with institutional autonomy and allows us to use our facilities more effectively. I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 33-B and

190 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

support No. 98.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): Speaking on behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I rise to support Proposal No. 33-B. It will clean up the legislation in No. 39 so that there will be limitations on athletically related activities during your nontraditional season.

If this is not passed, there will be no limitations there. You can have practice seven days a week. Already, we have practice during the traditional season only six days a week, so I urge your support on Proposal 33-B.

C. Michael Fox (North Carolina Wesleyan College): I would like to jask the NCAA Council the rationale for coming up with the four days when we just heard from a student-athlete and the North Coast Athletic Conference survey that kids during the nontraditional season are not missing class and are spending less than 10 hours a week.

I think it is another reason that we have overreacted and gone to four days. I agree that we missed the boat last year in Proposal 39 by not putting in the legislation a day off in the nontraditional, but we have gone from possibly seven days a week—which I don't know of any institution that is allowing teams to practice seven days a week—during the nontraditional season to four, which I think is too stringent.

And if I also could ask for some clarification on countable athleticsrielated activities. Is this individual or team? If an individual practices one day, for example in baseball, if you go out with a specific group, is that one student-athlete who can only practice four days or the whole team?

Mr. Carzo: We did have an interpretation on that last year. We have not look up whether one person constitutes the whole team or not. I think it did. We will find that out for you.

In response to your other question about why the Council thought this was wise to put in the legislation, it made no decision about the prudency of this legislation.

The Council felt it would give you the choice to decide. That is the reason you are going to make the decision. If we leave it out, half the people would want it in or would have said why did we not have it in. That is the way we started last year. So we put it back in to give you the option to decide what you wanted to do.

Mr. Fox: I asked for the rationale of the four days. Was that just an arbitrary date or was there a specific reason they came up with four days instead of giving the kids a day off every seven days?

Mr. Carzo: I think when they looked at the time commitments last 'year, it was predicated on a Division I survey. They decided at that point that what came before all three divisions was one day off inseason and two days off in nontraditional seasons. We followed along with that recommendation.

Mr. Fox: But this is more than two days off. This is three.

Mr. Carzo: Practicing four days. I am sorry. I misrepresented that.

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): Let me try to respond to that. I think what the thinking of at least the steering

Division III Business Session	
	191

committee was is that most people practice five days a week. So the reduction then was made to four. I think that is what the thinking was. Right or wrong, that is what I recall.

Mr. Carzo: Thank you, Jen. With respect to the other interpretation, we believe at this point that it is an individual who is counted. We want, to find it an array for the first it.

to find it on paper first.

Mr. Fox: I would encourage the delegates to vote against Proposal 31-B and consider other legislation to limit nontraditional.

[Part B of Proposal No. 33 (Page A-43) was defeated by Division III,

106-150, five abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Nancy L. Mitchell (NCAA): The answer to the question that you just asked is that the interpretation is applied on an individual basis in Divisions I and II. There is no official interpretation for Division III as of yet. But that is the interpretation that has been applied to Divisions I and II.

[Part C of Proposal No. 33 (Page A-43) was approved by Division; III, 186-66, six abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Full-Time Enrollment—Final Semester/Quarter

George M. Harmon (Millsaps College): On behalf of the NCAA. Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

Under current legislation, a student-athlete may be enrolled in less. than a full-time program of studies during the final semester or quarter of a baccalaureate program provided the student is taking the courses necessary to complete his or her degree. The student-athlete who utilizes this exception for the full-time enrollment requirement, however, forfeits all future eligibility.

Proposal No. 38, if adopted, would say that such a student-athlete-does not forfeit all future eligibility provided he or she completes all the degree requirements during the final term and is eligible to receive a degree upon the next degree-granting date. In keeping with the spirit of academic reform and the increased emphasis that is being placed on the importance of student-athletes obtaining a degree, I urge adoption of this proposal because it rewards those student-athletes who actually do receive a degree.

[Proposal No. 38 (Page A-61) was approved by Division III.]

Hardship Waiver—Division III

Nathan N. Salant (Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletics Conference): On behalf of the Middle Atlantic Conference, I hereby move Proposal No. 44, which regards the hardship waiver applicable, for Division III purposes only.

[The motion was seconded.]

Basically, what we seek to do is liberalize the medical-hardship waiver from its current requirement of a maximum of 20 percent of the events participated in to a higher number. The original proposal presented moved to 40 percent or four events, as is written. You will probably shortly have an amendment moved regarding that number.

Basically, our rationale is simply this. This is Division III. This is

supposed to be a participation-oriented group. We are in a situation where the student-athletes are paying their way. It certainly is not reasonable that a student-athlete who perhaps plays two series of downs in the first two football games of a season and does not play again that entire year because of medical problems loses that year. That does not seem very fair. That can be applied to virtually all the other sports. What we are seeking to do is liberalize that a little bit. True, someone could raise the issue that coaches could finagle around with this and try stouse it to their advantage. But again, the key issue is who is paying the bill? It is the student-athlete. It is not that easy, especially in this economic situation, to convince someone to undertake an extra year of college at that type of expense just to satisfy a whim to possibly win an extra football game or an extra event. So we urge you to support this. If there are any questions, I would be glad to answer them.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I move Proposal No. 44-1 as an amendment to No. 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think Nate spoke very well about the proposal. There are some schools that felt that maybe Proposal 44 went too far in liberalizing the rule and that Proposal 44-1 was movement that would address and be responsive to student problems and might be more receptive to the Convention. So it is before you.

(Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): Question. If Proposal 44-dis passed, would that mean eligibility would be retroactive back to previous years now for a person who was injured four years ago?

Mr. Carzo: No.

Mr. Eason: So it would just be from this time on?

Mr. Carzo: From the effective date on. Arthur, we have to hold on that because it is effective immediately. And it may include the current academic year, which means retroactive.

... Mr. Eason: All right.

Mr. Carzo: It will apply retroactively to benefit the student-athlete. It is officially interpreted that way to have applied in other situations, so it is precedented.

Sandra R. Weeden (State University of New York at Stony Brook): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 44-1. Currently, a student-athlete can play one minute and utilize a season of eligibility. The only exception to that is the hardship waiver.

To play in 40 percent or even 30 percent of an institution's contests and still be given back that season of competition does not seem appropriate. The Division III Steering Committee is in support of the current legislation of 20 percent.

Louis W. Spiotti (Rochester Institute of Technology): I am chair of the ECAC Eligibility Committee. I see numerous student-athletes who are deprived of competition because they played in only a few games. I think it is unfair. Particularly at the Division III level.

[Proposal No. 44-1 (Page A-73) was approved by Division III.]

Division III Business Session

[Proposal No. 44 (Page A-71) was approved by Division III as amended by No. 44-1.]

[NOTE: A request to consider Proposal No. 43 after it was not earlier moved was approved by the Chair.]

Hardship Waiver

John H. Harvey (Carnegie Mellon University): I would like the opportunity to see how people feel about Proposal No. 43. I personally feel that our hardship waiver situation is as good as it is as it currently stands. So I would like to move that we support Proposal No. 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): Did we not in just passing Proposal No. 44 as amended liberalize the hardship legislation and in passing No. 43 we would be liberalizing it even further by allowing what we have now as countable contests?

Mr. Carzo: That is correct, Don. I think No. 43 deals with the scrimmage situation. You would be liberalizing the hardship rule even

more. That is correct.

John D. Galaris (Salem State College): We have just taken a rule that has been on the books for many years and liberalized it, which I-personally favor.

However, I don't see taking the scrimmages and exhibition contests and excluding those in addition to what we have just done. So I would

urge the delegates to defeat No. 43.

James M. Malmquist (Gustavus Adolphus College): In further: interpretation of the retroactiveness of the rule, does that mean that students who have exercised the right to the rule—let's say that we have a student in school who was injured in one-third rather than 20 percent.

Mr. Carzo: You mean as it applies to No. 43?

Mr. Malmquist: As it applies to the one just passed, which would be affected by No. 43. A football player from last fall was injured in the third game. So we could have unequal administration of an injury—a student who has currently claimed the 20 percent and another group that could claim this rule in the third game, correct?

Mr. Carzo: Meaning the scrimmage. I guess the general rule is it would apply retroactively to benefit the student-athlete. If we vote in Proposal No. 43, the provisions of No. 43 would apply retroactively as well as the amended No. 44. So you are really liberalizing the hardship waiver to a considerable degree. I hope you realize what you are doing at

[Proposal No. 43 (Page A-70) was defeated by Division III.]

Transfer Eligibility—Division III

Nathan N. Salant (Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 48 regarding Division III transfer eligibility.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal was brought forth in conjunction with the NCAA legislative services staff. It is designed specifically to deal with a problem that last year's legislation inadvertently created—the appli-

194 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

cation of the Division I 24-credit academic progress rule as it affected student-athletes transferring to Division III institutions.

Official Notice regarding a student-athlete who was prevented from being eligible even though that person had a 4.000 grade-point average at one of the most prestigious Division I institutions in the country. It is our intent and our understanding from the NCAA staff that this is the way to go about making the change. What the change essentially would do is rather than require that the student-athlete have been academically eligible had he or she remained at the previous institution, it would say apply the rule of eligibility at the new institution. So essentially, that person who did not meet the 24-credit rule would not be penalized.

As it is explained in the rationale, there is a missed-term exception floating around out there that a student-athlete could apply for. However, in speaking with the NCAA legislative services folks, it was our understanding that that was not the intent of that missed term exception rule. We felt as a conference that it was inappropriate to force someone to use the missed-term exception rule in that circumstance.

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): I rise to speak in opposition to this proposal because I think under either the missed-term exception or a waiver situation we do have it covered.

It seems to me that the present legislation is fairly straightforward. We tend to just muddy it by changing it at this point. I would urge you to defeat Proposal No. 48.

Mr. Carzo: I would also remind you that you went the other way last year. You decided last year that you wanted to determine eligibility on the basis of where they transferred from.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): I feel this is bad legislation. Although we talk about a student who might be a good academic student at another institution, if this legislation is adopted as written, a student who is a poor student at another institution could transfer to an institution that has lower or no academic standards and be immediately eligible. It could open a Pandora's box. We are talking about looking at academics and I see this as very, very poor legislation and urge its defeat.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): Just to remind everybody, the Presidents Commission does oppose this.

[Proposal No. 48 (Page A-77) was defeated by Division III.]

Scouting of Opponents

Nathan N. Salant (Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Middle Atlantic Conference, I hereby move Proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

This addresses a problem that we noticed within our conference and then noticed outside of our conference. Some folks were taking all sorts of steps to scout opponents that had gone to an absolutely bizarre level. All that we are basically doing is saying there is not going to be room in

ivision III Business Session	
The Deligion	195

the press box or space at the event location for people who are trying to scout practices, scrimmages, exhibition games, preseason events, etc.

We think that is perfectly reasonable. If you want to talk about cost containment, it is ridiculous to send people out all different times all different places. Right now, Division III has absolutely no limitation in this area. We simply seek to add that type.

[Proposal No. 61 (Page A-90) was approved by Division III.]

Honorary Academic Awards

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: I move Proposal No. 70.

[The motion was seconded.]

Tim Brown (Skidmore College): I think that the Council opposed? this. As I read it, I would urge you to vote no because there is no cap on this. There is no limit as to the amount of money that this award may be.

[Proposal No. 70 (Page A-98) was defeated by Division III.]

Maximum Dates of Competition—Fencing

John M. Schael (Washington University): I move Proposal No. 912.7. [The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 91 (Page A-120) was approved by Division III.]

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): I move Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

I speak in support of this motion and mention that it does not fly in the face of reform.

The hockey group, and I speak for the NCAA Field Hockey Committee, is suggesting that it count contests and not dates of competitions. I don't believe it is a significant or perhaps even any enlargement.

I ask your support. It would treat maybe for the first time in this Convention field hockey and women's soccer in the same way. I believe they are comparable. I ask your support.

Marjorie B. Giles [Central College (Iowa)]: On behalf of the NCAA Council, I wish to express my opposition to this proposal.

This proposal has the potential to expand the amount of competition in which field hockey squads participate during each academic year. Accordingly, it is inconsistent with the reform agenda adopted by the membership at last year's Convention and should be defeated.

John D. Galaris (Salem State College): I believe that in the process of reform, an error was made and that field hockey should be treated as soccer is treated. It is illogical that there are fewer field hockey games permitted than there are soccer games. I urge the delegates to approve this.

Dolores A. Bogard (State University College at Cortland): As executive director of the New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association representing its 45 member institutions, we encourage your support for this resolution.

We recognize that field hockey has provided one of the longest standing organized competitive opportunities for women in athletics.

As such, we encourage its maintenance and its growth. This is not an addition to competition, but a correction of an oversight of what happened before. This only puts field hockey on the same level as soccer and attempts to create a level playing field for those young women who bove and play field hockey. We encourage its support.

**Cheryl Ish (Salisbury State University, NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): As a field hockey player, I would like to be given the same number of opportunities to compete as a soccer player.

These sports are similar in season length and time demands placed on the athlete. Therefore, it appears to be only fair that we also equate the number of contest opportunities. As a player, I would more than welcome a chance to play a few extra games.

Joy Hager (Berea College): I would like to ask a question to the people who are sponsoring this. Is this indeed increasing the number of contests? The one thing that I saw when we had contests and as I see it where on Page 114 is this meaning that we have 17 dates of competition of or we have 20 dates of competition or 20 contests or a combination of this two things?

3 Ms. Shillingford: It means that in Division III you would have 20 dates of competition.

Unidentified Delegate: No.

Ms. Shillingford: I am not the sponsor.

Ms. Hager: We have 20 dates of competition?

Linda E. Hopple (Franklin and Marshall College): It is not really increasing the number of dates. Many field hockey programs run preseason tournaments where in the past they have played three or four short games on a given day.

In the past, that would have counted as one of the 17 contests. Should Proposal 92 pass, there would be 20 contests. Playing four on that given day would bring our program down to 16 contests left. Went from 17 to 16 to 20 to 16.

Ms. Hager: Some of our conferences play two contests on a Saturday. Not three or four shortened games, but two regular contests. Right now, those are counted as one day of competition. With this legislation, we possibly would have—if we don't have a nontraditional season—less field hockey contests than we have now.

Ms. Hopple: If you had two games on one day, that would be counted as two of your 20.

Ms. Hager: So this could be less field hockey games rather than more?

Mr. Carzo: That is correct.

[Proposal No. 92 (Page A-121) was approved by Division III.]

Preseason Soccer Scrimmages

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: I move Proposal No. 94.

[The motion was seconded.]

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): As I was walking up to the microphone, I heard someone say "What does it do?"

vision III Business Session		197
-----------------------------	--	-----

That is what I hope to explain to you.

It is my understanding that this does not increase the playing season. It does not increase the number of contests. It just allows for scrimmages, to be played earlier than they would have been allowed to be played. In some respects, this reduces the time demands on the student-athletes; by not forcing all of the contests into a shorter time period. I believe that 32 the Presidents Commission did support it.

[Proposal No. 94 (Page A-123) was approved by Division III.]

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons—Dividing Segments Louis W. Spiotti (Rochester Institute of Technology): I move Proposal No. 95.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 95 represents a response to the growing sentiment to place sensible limits on the extent of nontraditional seasons in Division III.

Proposal 95 simply says schools that conduct a nontraditional season in the fall have to complete it by October 30. Ample time to have tryouts, teach fundamentals and achieve some fitness goals. Likewise, those who conduct a nontraditional season in the spring could not begin before February 1. Given the weather and space limitations we all face, calculate that and it will net about the same amount of time as provided in the fall.

If we are indeed searching for ways to limit the call on resources and. on our student-athletes' time, No. 95 is a measure that we can accept in the spirit of reform while maintaining the quality of our programs. We also add this in conjunction with No. 98, as proposed by the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference, represents a real good. package for controlling nontraditional segments.

Laurie Priest (Mount Holyoke College): I would like to speak against Proposal No. 95 in that I would like to permit each institution to determine what is most appropriate, what the time span is and when to offer the nontraditional seasons.

For example, at Mount Holyoke we have a January term where we have students taking just a few courses. That is when we typically hold two weeks out of our three-week session for volleyball that we do in our nontraditional season. It does not take away from class time and crunch the students' schedules as much as it might. So I would like to speak against this because I would like each institution to have the opportunity to determine what is most appropriate at their institution.

John H. Harvey (Carnegie Mellon University): I would like to speak for Proposal No. 95. I think it achieves some of the separation of seasons that we tried to achieve in both Proposals 31 and 32. I think this motion is a good move that separates seasons and achieves some desirable things.

[Proposal No. 95 (Page A-124) was approved by Division III, 145-90.1

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons-**Athletically Related Activities**

Nathan N. Salant (Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic

1992 Convention Proceedings

Conference): On behalf of the Middle Atlantic Conference, I move Proposal No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ladies and gentlemen I certainly understand the issue and that the words "captains' practices" are like a red flag initially when people see withose words. They say what in the world would any conference or any group in Division III want with permitting captains' practices? Let me assure you that, in essence and in theory, we are totally opposed to them. The problem is enforceability. I can stand here as an attorney and say to you when you have rules on the books that are totally unenforceable, you are looking for trouble.

I am not saying we should allow captains' practices. But I am saying if you can come up with a way to enforce the rule prohibiting them, please let us know. That is the major reason why we are proposing this, to take something out of there that simply cannot be enforced.

a Sandra R. Weeden (State University of New York at Stony Brook): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I rise in opposition to

 $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ I am not sure I have to because Nate spoke against it. Basically, the steering committee believes it was only a year ago that these were considered countable athletically related activities.

We just passed it. We have not even lived with it a year. We believe that this would be in opposition to the reform movement. So let's leave it as it is and work with it for now and defeat this proposal.

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): The Presidents Commission does oppose Proposal No. 96 and believes it will erode the

[Proposal No. 96 (Page A-125) was defeated by Division III.] [NOTE: The Division III business session was recessed at 3:55 p.m. and reconvened at 4.05 p.m.]

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons— **Athletically Related Activities**

Nathan N. Salant (Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 97.

[The motion was seconded.]

This basically addresses a safety issue specifically in the field portion of track and field. It would permit a coach to be present during the individual workouts outside of the traditional season in that sport. It is a safety issue. It already applies to Division I and Division II in track. Their athletes might conceivably be a little bit more skilled, a little bit more talented than a Division III athlete.

If they are saying it is safer, legally speaking and logically speaking, we might be well advised to adopt it in Division III.

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: I rise to speak in opposition to this proposal. I think one of the problems that we have in Division III is we sometimes try to be too much like Divisions I and II. If it were a safety issue, then I don't understand why the two words "or skill" are spelled out. I urge defeat of this motion.

wision III Business Session		100
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1 44

Matthew Leighninger (Haverford College, NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): As has just been pointed out by Mr. Salant, the track and field events, particularly the field events, can be quite dangerous.

I think the reason the word skill is in there is particularly because of pole vaulting, which can be a very dangerous thing. It involves, suspending yourself 15 to 20 feet over the ground and over a mat your may land on but sometimes don't. It is not just involving direction or just a person watching, but having to correct the person who is doing the actual activity. That is why skill is needed in pole vaulting in particular. I think this is something that Division III should have. Not because Divisions I and II already have these measures, but perhaps a despite the fact that they do.

Division III, I would think, should have less possibility of use of this measure and also probably more in need of it because we have less expert athletes. We have more beginning athletes who are not quite sure what they are doing. In the interests of safety, I think we should support Proposal No. 97.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): This basically allows individual field event practice beyond 26 weeks a year. Every day of the entire year a field event athlete can practice with a coach.

Ralph Honderd (Calvin College): I just feel that with the limit on facilities that we have in Division III, to try to find a place other than the weeks that we have to practice is difficult. Plus it puts a tremendous amount of pressure on a coach to be out there many more weeks than he really should be. So I would vote no.

[Proposal No. 97 (Page A-125) was defeated by Division III. Later, motion to reconsider also was defeated.]

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons— Nontraditional Segment

Layton Shoemaker (Messiah College): On behalf of the Middle Atlantic Conference, I would like to move Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

The members of our conference believe that a more appropriate way. to count the practice and competitive opportunities in the nontraditional? segment is to allow a specific number rather than doing it in consecutive weeks.

The reason for this is because on many campuses there may be other conflicts that preclude you from practicing on a given set of days or weeks. And if you practice on one day of one week and then you cannot get in the facility for the next three or four days or even two weeks, you still have to count those weeks because they are your consecutive week segment.

This allows a greater opportunity for institutions to have the autonomy to distribute the practice and competitive opportunities in a way that best suits their individual needs.

Richard Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): Considering some of the previous proposals, there has been opposition expressed to

200 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

limiting the competition during the nontraditional season and allowing individual institutions to make their own decisions. At the same time, there has been concern expressed with regard to making the application of some of the missed class time and day off provisions applicable to both the traditional and nontraditional seasons.

Therefore, I move division of the question with regard to Proposal 98 so that Part A and Part B may be considered separately.

[The motion was seconded but failed.]

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): Originally the steering committee was opposed to Proposal 98 because it felt that it is not increased in the number of dates of practice and competition. But with the failure of Proposal 33-B and not having any limits in practice days in the nontraditional season, we feel it is very important that at least Part B of this proposal be supported. We withdraw our opposition and support Proposal 98.

Rosalie Resch (University of Chicago): I have a question for the proposer. You argued that this 26 dates would allow greater flexibility of facility problems.

My understanding is with the 21-week counting you would still use one of those weeks. So you would gain no advantage on the flexibility sissue. Is that correct or does this somehow make the 21 weeks irrelevant?

Mr. Salant: I am not sure that I can relate the question to the way we proposed it. I don't think one has an effect on the other.

Ms. Resch: For instance, if you used 15 weeks in the fall and had six weeks, as soon as you used one day of practice of those 26 you would use up that entire week. So would you then have five remaining weeks to use the 25 days?

Mr. Salant: That is correct.

Linda C. Hackett (Smith College): If I understand this legislation correctly, it would extremely limit the ability to offer the sport of tennis in the North.

LI you are offering tennis in the fall as your traditional component, with most of your competition, even in New England, that is eight weeks. So when it comes to the nontraditional season, we would only have 26 days. I think that is entirely too short.

[Proposal No. 98 (Page A-126) was defeated by Division III, 122-125.]

[NOTE: A motion to recount the vote on Proposal No. 98 was seconded but failed.]

Division III Preseason Practice Opportunities— Traditional Segment

*Louis Spiotti (Rochester Institute of Technology): I move Proposal No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal takes into consideration the natural resource limitation that exists in Division III and provides for flexibility so institutions may

Ivision III Business Se	ession	
		20
		207

adjust their own calendars and capitalize on divisional strength, which is our ability to govern ourselves.

Although a winter starting date—October 15—is no change over the current rule, our conference is confident that the contest limits that are now in place require a day off and the natural breaks in our calendars are enough limits in themselves.

Twenty fall practice opportunities is a fair way to control starting dates given diverse institutional calendars. The third week in January will provide a great number of us a way to deal with not only space and time constraints that exist for our teams, but the call on these facilities by our entire campus community. Just imagine attempting to address all these interests with a start date of February 1. There would be tremendous stress on our facilities. There would be activity early morning until late evening.

Proposal No. 99 provides us with an out. We urge the adoption to divert some serious problems that we may not foresee.

Jeffrey Vennell (University of Rochester): Lou, since we now have Proposal 39, which says the start date for fall sports is August 24 for practice or competition, is this negating this by 20 practice opportunities?

Mr. Spiotti: This is meant to work in conjunction with Proposal No. 101, which establishes starting dates for contests.

[NOTE: Proposal No. 101 was reordered to be voted on before Nos.]
99 and 100.]

First Contest or Date of Competition—Division III Fall Sports Mr. Spiotti: I move Proposal No. 101.

[The motion was seconded.]

We believe Proposal 101 provides flexibility for starting dates for fall sports. It will serve as a uniform guide for fall sports and the operation of our programs. Simplicity of rules relative to start dates will facilitate communications with our coaches and those in charge of scheduling. The position of the conference has been to seek a middle ground for what was and what is being proposed.

The 11-week contests start date is more restrictive than the existing legislation. We are not as restricted as the approved legislation. The features of this proposal are its flexibility, it will facilitate the operation of our programs and it is more restrictive than previous rules proposals. It also is designed to tighten up Proposal No. 39, which was the legislation that was proposed last year.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): I have a question. Could the proposers of this amendment give us some examples of dates with what we currently have on the books when the first contest would be played and with what this amendment suggests when the first contest would be played in the fall sports. Do you have that information available?

Mr. Spiotti: Counting back from the first round of national championships in football, for instance, the first contest date would be September 5, 1992.

1992 Convention Proceedings

Unidentified Delegate: How about soccer?

Mr. Spiotti: The 29th or 30th of August.

Mr. Carzo: Volleyball?

Mr. Spiotti: I don't have that, but I can get it.

Linda C. Hackett (Smith College): On the second pink sheet dates were given based on a certain number of weeks in each category—football II weeks, 9-5. But look at soccer, 10 weeks, 8-30. So if you made it 11 weeks, would that not make it 8-21? And if you look at field hockey, it will be two weeks earlier than the 9-4. We would be establishing starting dates for competition that would be in August. Are you suggesting that that should be a better method than the August 24 method?

Mr. Spiotti: We say it is more restrictive.

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): I would strongly urge you to reject this. I think it is perhaps the most erosive proposal yet as against last year's Proposal No. 39

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: Proposal No. 101 really does not the into No. 99. If you propose the 11-week starting date prior to the national championships and then you start to introduce 20 practice opportunities, you are bringing your studentathletes back around August 12. I don't think that is what direction we are moving in.

This might be one of those issues where we have to come back next eyear and really define what it is we have to do in order to accommodate the starting date for the fall sports. I can assure you that Washington University in St. Louis is impacted by the starting date of August 24 for games and our practice, as we will be doing next year. I say that because we have orientation on the 24th. We have orientation on the 25th, and then we start classes on the 26th. That is terrible.

You obviously don't want to combine those two. But I think we are sort of caught this year. What we have to do is come back next year and address that particular issue.

James R. Appleton (University of Redlands): It is late afternoon. It would be easy for us not to pay attention to a lot of this detail. This is a proposal that moves us in the opposite direction from which this Convention under Division III has been moving. I strongly oppose it. [Proposal No. 101 (Page A-128) was defeated by Division III.]

Division III Preseason Practice Opportunities— Traditional Segment

Louis W. Spiotti (Rochester Institute of Technology): I move

[The motion was seconded.]

I think I described the rationale in my previous presentation.

James R. Appleton (University of Redlands): This is exactly the same problem as on the previous item. I note the winter semester date of October 15 as contrasted to the November 1 date that has held for some time in our discussions today. I strongly oppose it.

[Proposal No 99 (Page A-127) was defeated by Division III.]

yyision III Business Ses	sion	20

Division III Preseason Practice Opportunities— Traditional Segment

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I moves

[The motion was seconded.]

As will happen, Proposal No. 100 was put together to try to address a problem that we saw coming with an August 24 start for the first day of practice for field hockey, volleyball, soccer for men and women, and cross country. It was our idea to try to guarantee that in all of those sports there would be at least a modest preseason opportunity to get the young people ready to compete. We attempted to do that with this legislation by allowing a maximum of 21 practice opportunities thinking that there would be something like Proposal 33-B in place that would in the sport of soccer, for instance, have the first Friday following Labor Day as the first contest date.

It has been brought to my attention by our colleagues in the University Athletic Association that with that failure we are left with what is on the books. The legislation on the books says that August 24 is your first day for practice and/or competition. That obviously flaws this legislation in that I don't think any of us want to take 21 practice opportunities marching back from August 24. That was not our intentity when we put this legislation on the books.

I think the concept is good. If some time during the legislative session somebody who voted on the prevailing side wants to reintroduce. Proposal 33-B and have that approved, No. 100 would probably be much more acceptable. But in its current form with what we have on the books, it probably is wrong. So it is before you. We would certainly entertain any debate or other ideas that people might have that could help us get out of a little box that we find ourselves in.

[Proposal No. 100 (Page A-127) was defeated by Division III.]

Preseason Basketball Practice Opportunities— Division III Basketball

C. Michael Fox (North Carolina Wesleyan College): On behalf of the sponsors, I would like to move Proposal No. 102.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 102 attempts to restore adequate team preseason practices time to the basketball coaches. The sponsors feel that a November 1 starting date is unfair and does not permit coaches sufficient time to condition, evaluate and teach the necessary individual and team skills necessary for competition.

For example, in the 1992-93 academic year, the first permissible contest date is November 20. With the required day off every seven days, this permits only 17 practice days prior to the opening date of November 20. In order to avoid playing three games per week and mission more class time, institutions need to begin their seasons at the earliest permissible contest date.

Over the next three years the number of preseason practice opportunities decreases to as low as 15 because of the varying date of

Thanksgiving. The sponsors recognize there is a difference between Division III and Divisions I and II in terms of philosophy and level of play. However, our student-athletes and coaches deserve adequate time to prepare for their season. The sponsors encourage the adoption of Proposal 102.

William E. Lide (Salisbury State University): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 102. This represents in our opinion an expansion of the season in the sport of basketball that also could represent an increase in the time student-athletes spend on athletically related activities.

Starting our on-court practice prior to November 1, which in this proposal would be around October 22 in 1992, is an expansion of the season. Even in Division III, we believe it is important to be attentive to this issue. Therefore, I urge your defeat of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 102 (Page A-129) was defeated by Division III.]

Preseason Practice Opportunities—Division III Basketball
Nathan N. Salant (Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 103.

[The motion was seconded.]

We were reacting to two areas. No. 1, the decision last year that impacted the starting date for basketball practice and, No. 2, our hope for passing earlier, which did not occur, of the 21 practice opportunities measure.

However, this still may be logical and applicable to the sport of men's basketball in that it gives some relief from the proposed starting date that would occur this year and goes with the 21 opportunities, which does not necessarily translate into 21 days. So it is moot,

Mr. Carzo: It would only be moot if we passed Proposals 99, 100 and 102. So 103, according to our Parliamentarian, is not moot. We would need to vote on it.

David L. Warren: (Ohio Wesleyan University): On your white sheet, you will note the Presidents Commission did review and does oppose.

Mr. Schael: I have one question for clarification. When we talk about practice opportunities in Proposal 103, how are we defining practice opportunities? Are we excluding Sundays?

Mr. Carzo: I don't know if that is up to interpretation, but in football think you do.

Mr. Schael: In football you do. That is how it is defined in Section 17 in the NCAA Manual when you use the words "practice opportunities." I just wanted to know if we exclude Sundays.

Mr. Salant: There was no intention to change the current definitions as they exist in the Manual. So you would exclude Sundays and Saturdays would count as two, if memory serves me correctly. That is why I mentioned that it would not necessarily be 21 days.

Mr. Carzo: Do you mean Saturdays in season or when classes are started or just Saturdays?

Mr. Salant: It would depend upon whether you are in session or not.

¿Division III	Business Session	
5.0	- Harriess Densiton	 205

You do conceivably have a vacation period in there.

Mr. Carzo: But the point is you are counting them like they do in football at the present time?

Mr. Salant: Yes. We are not seeking to change that definition.

Mr. Schael: But that does not seem to be right. The way the Manual reads is that if you are in session you count one for each day.

You are talking about your fall sports. You would count one for each day that classes are in session. Then two for each day that practice occurs when you are out of session. So if we try to apply this to basketball, I just don't see how you get the two days in there and count Saturdays as two practice days. How do you do that because you are in session?

Marjorie B. Giles [Central College (Iowa)]: The Division III a Steering Committee opposes this proposal. It has the potential to sestablish the start of an institution's playing season beyond the current slimits and is inconsistent with the reform agenda adopted by the membership at last year's Convention.

[Proposal No. 103 (Page A-129) was defeated by Division III.]

Maximum Contest Limitations and Exemptions— Division III Baseball and Softball

Holly P. Gera (Montclair State College): On behalf of the New Jersey Athletic Conference, I would like to move adoption of Proposal 104.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would allow our baseball and softball athletes to fully participate in contests during official school vacation periods while not impinging upon their class and academic time.

George M. Harmon (Millsaps College): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I rise to oppose this proposal. The proposal would exempt the number of traditional segment contests played during an institution's vacation period.

Therefore, it could significantly increase the overall number of institutional contests in a given academic year far beyond present limitations. This would be inconsistent with the Association's reformagenda related to playing and practice limitations. The steering committee urges you to vote against this proposal.

James Dimick (St. Olaf College): I am wearing two hats. I am also, the president of the American Baseball Coaches Association for the upcoming year.

I just came from Dallas. The vast majority of the Division III baseball coaches would be in favor of this proposal. We also would point out that if you compare the number of contests that are played between divisions, that baseball and softball are way out of line.

Look at Division I basketball and Division III basketball. If we had the same percentage, our women's basketball would be about 18 games. If we compared it to football, we would be playing seven or eight football games. In Divisions I and II, they played 56 baseball games. We are limited to 36.

________ 1992 Convention Proceeding

The last thing I would say is that almost everybody is going South today in Division III to play baseball games. You have a spring break that takes one week and two weekends. The current restriction of 36 games is forcing teams to go South and have open dates when they don't play or they are playing one game rather than a double-header. They take 28 players down there and platoon to give many student-athletes an opportunity to play, and you are playing one game where coaches are well and only thing the sum of th

We don't think that this legislation is going to abuse the number of games so it is out of line at all.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): I would react to a comment one of the students from the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee made earlier about just simply wanting to play. I would agree with that, but I have some problem with the fact that each one of us has different kinds of financial restraints.

Some schools are located in the South, so taking a southern trip is not a big deal Others of us are in a position where our students have to fund-raise in order to be able to afford to take those trips. I am not sure the being able to play more games. But we are talking about students being able to play more games. But we are putting each other in a situation where if we vote this in more and more coaches are going to want to make those trips South. We are going to be in a position where we are either coming up with the money ourselves or we are telling the

I think that is a difficult position to be in, a difficult position to put our students in and a difficult position to put our budgets in.

C. Michael Fox (North Carolina Wesleyan College): Unless I count these games.

You could be on your vacation period at home. You could be playing at home. You do not have to spend the money to go on the road to exempt these games. Is that correct?

Mr. Carzo: I understand. I agree with you.

[Proposal No. 104 (Page A-130) was defeated by Division III.]

Maximum Contest Limitations—Division III Football
Nathan N. Salant (Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic
Proposal No. 106.

The motion was seconded.

Last year this group voted to reduce the number of permissible contests by one in Division III football. There is substantial feeling in Our conference that that was not necessary based on several factors. Our football people have said it already is a heavily restricted sport that conducts no nontraditional season in Division III. The student-athletes already are there. Institutions are not shortening their preseasons. Intersquad scrimmages are simply being replaced by intrasquad same situation in that sport. So again, there is no savings.

gision [[[Business Session	
(3.)	- 401/1620 06201011	
g(∻au) >		202

Opponents tend to be very local so minimal expenses are involved. But most importantly of all, this is a sport that is heavily restricted already. We have listened to appeals from student-athletes from some other sports saying let us play. And no missed class time is involved in having that preseason scrimmage in football.

These are Saturday and Sunday or holiday or Friday night events. So on behalf of the Middle Atlantic Conference, we ask that you consider

Robert G. Bottoms (DePauw University): On behalf of the steering

committee, I speak in opposition to Proposal 106.

Any way we look at it, it clearly adds one contest. It clearly adds some expense and clearly increases the time demand on the students. Furthermore, it is one of the pieces of legislation we have seen this afternoon that reverses what we did last year. We are opposed.

William T. Klika Jr. (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison): Using a specific situation, schools today if given the choice of playing a

scrimmage or game will choose a game.

Therefore, a school that wants to have nine in a scrimmage will not be able to find an opponent, making it more expensive because you will now have to have a game if you want the 10 opportunities. The athlete who pays the money deserves the opportunity. Don't disenfranchise

Edward M. Matejkovic (State University College at Brockport) Contrary to what the gentleman said, there is not a cost factor, nor: ... more time on the students. If you look at the existing legislation, athletes this year in football will probably come in around August 15 or 16. They already will be on campus. A scrimmage generally would occur

the Saturday prior to the opening of the season.

Last year we scrimmaged a school that was 20 minutes away. It cost \$170 to transport our kids there and back. This year in a return scrimmage it would cost zero dollars to run it because the officials come out for free. They also need some preseason experience. So the net cost would be about \$90 in the football program if you average it out over two years, with no increased time for the students and an opportunity: to practice against someone other than the student-athletes who have: been practicing against each other for the two weeks during the camp

As in all other sports, it is giving football athletes the opportunity tohave a practice scrimmage before their season opens. I think most?

coaches would opt for 10 games anyway.

Ralph Kirchenheiter (Muhlenberg College): I think it is important to stress the safety part of it. Many of us are operating with squads that are rather limited in numbers. The opportunity to scrimmage against. somebody else is not very expensive. It does not affect the academic calendar and it sure does provide a much safer experience because we don't have the same kids on the field beating each other up. They get a chance to play in a much more organized and safer fashion.

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): The Presidents

Commission did review and does oppose Proposal No. 106. We believe both in perception and reality it is a setback to the reform package.

[Proposal No. 106 (Page A-133) was defeated by Division III.]

Maximum Dates of Competition Limitations-**Division III Tennis**

Ellen Staurowsky (William Smith College): On behalf of the Empire Athletic Association, I would like to move Proposal No. 107. [The motion was seconded.]

Fundamentally, this proposal is intended to recognize the growing importance of tournament play for tennis by increasing the number of tournaments from three to four.

In an effort to respect the ongoing efforts to reduce playing opportunities, the addition of one tournament opportunity is balanced by a reduction in the number of dates of competition from 22 to 20.

Sandra R. Weeden (State University of New York at Stony Brook): The Division III Steering Committee supports this. We think this is a reasonable proposal. It is not in opposition to the spirit of the reform

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-134) was approved by Division III.]

Dates of Competition—Division III Women's Volleyball Louis W. Spiotti (Rochester Institute of Technology): On behalf of the Empire Athletic Association, I move Proposal No. 108.

[The motion was seconded.]

The aim of Proposal 108 is to bring volleyball in line with other fall sports and recognize that volleyball, because it is guided by dates rather than contests, often subjects athletes to tournament play involving in some cases a full day of contests.

It seems it would be healthy to adopt this proposal not only for consistency purposes, but also to reduce time demands on our studentathletes and demands on our resources.

Dolores A. Bogard (State University College at Cortland): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I rise to speak in support of Proposal 108.

, It does represent a reduction in number of dates of competition in Division III women's volleyball and does continue our reform package. We urge your support for Proposal 108.

- David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): I find myself in the unusual position of supporting the Empire Athletic Conference and happily do so. I think this is in the right direction.

[Proposal No. 108 (Page A-135) was defeated by Division III. Originally approved, motion to reconsider was approved.] [The Division III business session was recessed at 5:15 p.m.]

Thursday Morning, January 9, 1992

The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m., with Rocco Carzo, Tufts University, presiding.

aings _{光:} 艦片:	Division III Business Ses:	ston	209
	•		209

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Carzo: Would the delegates please take their seats?

When we concluded our meeting yesterday, we finished up all of our voting. We have a couple of issues that are particularly relevant to Division III that we would like to make sure that you are aware of. We can follow through with some support for these proposals.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Division I-AAA Football

Mr. Carzo: Proposal No. 34 is the development of the Division I-AAA football division. You may recall as a result of the restructuring that we did last year that we worked very hard for very long periods of time to support the Division I-AAA concept that would allow Division I-ASA schools to play football in a nonscholarship framework.

This proposal obviously is extremely relevant to them. If it does not pass, they cannot do it. But the important thing is that we are committed to that concept because it isolates the Division III championship for Division III people. I mention that to you now so that I can remind you of our commitment to support that proposal. We don't know how the voting will go. There is some concern that I have heard expressed previously that does not affect us, but that affects the Division I-AAA people in terms of their own mentality on this issue and there is some sentiment that if Division I-AAA is formed it will draw people from Divisions II and I-AA. I guess there is a little bit of concern about that, but we have not heard anything officially about what position those people would take. I think Division I-A is supporting it very strongly. We know Division III is going to support it very strongly, so we will find out this afternoon.

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): I did hear last night that it has failed in a straw poll in Division II. I also heard that Division I is waffling. I worked on legislation involved with this for about five years. I think we need to understand that we have about 23 schools that are very significant members of the NCAA. My concern is that should Division I-AAA be defeated that those people possibly will request to come back to Division III. I think they would have a reasonable chance to request that.

What is the feeling of the steering committee on that?

Mr. Carzo: First of all, it has to pass all three divisions. Secondly, I don't think they can come back.

Edward G. Coll (Alfred University): I am speaking in the absence of David Warren. We need to remind our Division III members that the Presidents Commission, particularly the Division III group, feels that we have a moral obligation to support this legislation. A moral obligation that was made both privately to the Division III members affected and also publicly in David's appeal to have this legislation passed at the last Convention. So I hope we don't have any waffling within Division III and that we stand strong on this.

I know it is important to the members who are involved and certainly

simportant to all of our Division III constituency.

to Dennis' question on the possibility of the Division I-AAA concept to Dennis' question on the possibility of the Division I-AAA concept failing and the ability for the Division I-AAA schools that were disenfranchised to come back and ask to be included in Division III football, that would take legislation similar to what is before us right now. It is my understanding that it would be voted on by all divisions separately and would have to pass all divisions.

Consequently, without the support of Division III in bringing them back into Division III, that could not happen. But I would like to suggest a better strategy. Not only should we vote for it, but we should reincourage our colleagues in Division II. I think there is a lot of misinformation floating around in Division II. Much of it came from Division I-AA commissioners who are concerned that if there is Division I-AAA football, that it is going to be too attractive to some of their Division I-AA members and it is going to impact the strength of Division I-AA in the future.

Consequently, you do have colleagues in Division II who you can make contact with and urge them to consider the benefits of honoring our commitment that was made last year to try to provide an opportunity for those members who have been disenfranchised and right now do not shave a place to go. I would encourage you to do that.

Mr. Carzo: That also means feeling free to stand up in the general sassembly to speak in favor of the proposal. I am sure a lot of people will speak in support, but the more the better. They cannot get back into the championship unless legislation changes. So I would feel a little bit suncomfortable about that, as I know you all would.

Division-Specific Playing Rules

Mr. Carzo: Proposal No. 118 also is in line with our progression last year. You will all recall that we had a very serious concern in Division III with the goal-post changes.

We fought and did everything we could to get that changed. Obviously we did not get it done. Part of the thing that we did accomplish is we delayed the effective date of the 25-second clock until this year with the idea that we were going to submit Proposal 118 or legislation to allow us to get division-specific rules where there is financial impact.

Let me tell you where it is right now so that you understand it. I think the proposal is very strongly supported by all divisions. They understand our position. What they are concerned about is whether or not we destroy the integrity of the game and the consistency of the game throughout the divisions. I think that is all handled in the legislation. We are really concerned about financial impact as it relates to Division III.

Most of the Divisions I and II schools already have the 25-second clock. We have a problem and it is kind of a peculiar set of circumstances in that the effective date of the legislation is for last year. The implementation of the 25-second clock was delayed a year. This will

10	 1992 Convention Proceeding	,

2

allow us to decide division specifically. However, there is a problem I am trying to think of how to simplify this. The effective date of this legislation is August '92.

The NCAA Football Rules Committee meets after these meetings. If we need to apply for a waiver, there will not be a waiver opportunity in time simply because the people in Division III have to budget and would have to have money available just in case the waiver fails, I guess. But, in the meantime, we would not know where we stand with the division-specific rules prior to August or late May. I brought this problem to the Executive Committee.

We discussed it in the Administrative Committee. I think the Administrative Committee and the Executive Committee are going to deal directly with the football rules committee to figure out a way to alleviate this in a timely fashion so that we will find out as soon as possible after the football rules committee meets after this meeting. So you should be notified in due course at the end of this Convention when that meeting is over whether or not that opportunity exists.

I think we are in pretty good shape. Judy has assured us that we will be notified in a timely fashion.

Jeffrey Vennell (University of Rochester): Last year there were two parts to this. One had to do with playing opportunities. The original is letters went all the way up the ladder and included, in addition to financial limitations and expenses, playing time opportunities in different divisions. At the top of that was not part of this legislation.

I wonder if this group is still interested in having its steering committee try that avenue again. Soccer rules were the case. For some reason the Executive Committee decided that that should not be a part of this legislation.

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): I think the ad hoc committee that met in July to review this piece of legislation determined that the participation rates were really difficult to measure.

It could not really get a handle on participation. It could get a handle on financial, so the reason that legislation was drafted that way is based on what you could actually get a handle on and measure.

Mr. Carzo: They felt it was extremely difficult to draft legislation at that had words like substitution rule or participation rates.

Mr. Vennell: The term was significant-playing opportunities.

Mr. Carzo: Yes. Anyway, the legislative people felt that that would complicate the issues and would not solve what we wanted it to solve and it would not be passed and the best way to start was the financial impact.

So you would like to know whether or not we want to move in the direction of having division-specific rules apply to participation rates?

Mr. Vennell (University of Rochester): Correct.

Mr. Carzo: Is everyone clear in terms of what we are trying to get a feel for, whether or not the Division III body still feels as though the opportunity for division-specific rules should include participation rates or participation opportunities?

12 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings :

Robert R. Peck (Williams College): Has it been determined what would be the outcome if a specific conference decided to disregard this particular rule? What would be the judgment of the NCAA? What would be the consequences if a specific conference decided not to do it?

with the goal-post issue. You would be playing in noncompliance. If your conference did not go to a championship, it would not bother you at all. But when you are in noncompliance, all sports are deprived of the copportunity to participate in championships.

It did not apply sport specifically as I recall. We had that interpreta-

Mr. Peck: Who made that interpretation? I have never seen that written or come around. I am not doubting it is true. But where was that interpretation made? Is it put down someplace so we can see it? I am asking if a conference decides not to use the clocks, what is the penalty?

Rocky just mentioned that we would be in noncompliance. Therefore, all of our student-athletes would not be able to participate. I assume that was written somewhere. I would like to know who made that. Is it written down? Is there somewhere we have been informed of that?

when. But I know that I specifically called the NCAA office to ask that question because we had the same question. I had many phone calls that year asking me that question. So if there is a way, we need to have that done officially.

Nancy said we will check with the staffliaison to the rules committee. We will make a note to do that. Thanks, Bob. That was a good question.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I know that in some sports conferences are allowed to go for a year or two using experimental rules—wider soccer goals, shorter soccer goals, wider shooting arcs.

Maybe for this particular year, if all the Division III members that play football want to experiment with no visible time clock and that was approved, it would buy us a year to make sure that everything is in place.

Mr. Carzo: We will make a note of that and check again. Last year lasked that question. For some reason, we could not do that and declare ourselves experimental with keeping the football goal posts wider last year.

We tried to use that avenue in terms of preserving the width of the goal posts. It did not work, but we will recheck that. That is a good thing to follow up on.

Drug-Testing Consent Form

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): Proposal No. 41-1 represents something that I think we sort of missed because it is going to cause some hardship on Division III schools. But if No. 41-1 fails, it would almost destroy the drug-testing program as it now exists.

Proposal 41-1 says that the drug-testing consent form must be

Division III	Business	Session	
--------------	----------	---------	--

administered separately from the regular student-athlete statement. It gives you either before the first day of practice or the first four weeks of school.

In Division III we don't recruit our student-athletes. For some of us it is hard to identify your spring-sport athletes. You wait until they come out. It makes it very difficult to do this. But I understand there is going to be an interpretation that will provide us with an exception for the fall athletes. This will apply only to the recruited returning student-athletes. So if you say realistically you don't recruit, you would only have to get together all of your returning athletes for the winter and the spring sports in one day before the fourth week of classes to administer this drug-testing consent form.

The steering committee plans before the 1993 Convention to come forth with legislation to remove this from the constitution and put it in the bylaws. That way we will be able to do whatever we want with it to make it easier on the Division III membership. Any questions?

John D. Galaris (Salem State College): You said this would destroy the drug-testing program if it did not pass. Could you explain why?

Mr. Eason: The legality of the drug-testing program is being challenged in the courts.

In Division III we only drug test if you go to the championships. But with Division I, especially Division I football, they are drug testing year-round. They not only are testing the scholarship or the recruited athlete, but they are looking to randomly test some of the walk-ons. So the form has to be signed prior to practice so that the drug-testing people can come in and start to administer the program. This is in Division I. It has been challenged in the court. That sometimes delays it, and that is not what we want.

Mr. Galaris: One more question. You said an interpretation is coming forward. But the corollary to that is if a student-athlete has not signed before the first day of practice or by the fourth week, that they are now not eligible to participate in athletics? Because that is the suggestion. At least that is the inference I am getting from what you are saying.

Mr. Eason: Yes. That would be the case. They would have to sign that before the first week or the first day of practice. But again, that is your returning and recruited athletes.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I think you are taking a very simplistic view of being allowed to designate athletes as nonrecruited. We all know that athletes become recruited athletes any time you are initiating any kind of contact.

If you talk to a prospective student-athlete once, that individual is a recruited student-athlete. It may have been a phone call for two minutes in August to a baseball player, but that individual is a recruited athlete. So now if you say if you don't sign him by the fourth week he cannot play baseball. That is a little more difficult than the very simplistic approach. You said that you just want your recruited athletes. I think it is going to be difficult for a lot of us to get all the

people we have talked to, maybe hundreds of students for our spring and winter sports, by the fourth week. If we don't get them, they cannot participate.

think another thing has been overlooked. I got an interpretation from the staff about this. Some of us have a number of athletes who are under 18. We have to send that form home to the parents. That means we have to accomplish this for the fall sports before they come. Our option is to hold that student-athlete out. They come August 24. They are under 18. We now have to send that form home and hope to find the eparents right away so that individual can then practice.

What you are forcing us to do is check birthdays before August 24 to complete that form for those student-athletes who are under 18 who need the signature of a parent or guardian. That is a significant portion for kids for us. It always has been a significant portion of our kids for the fall sports. Now you are forcing me to also identify baseball players and basketball players who are under 18 and have that form signed early. I am going to be Fed Exing 35 or 40 forms August 24 or thereabouts to get parental signatures for kids who are under 18.

'f Now, I can withhold those. A basketball player only needs to sign before they compete. A lot of kids turn 18 in October and November. I don't have to Fed Ex those forms around the country. I am going to have to do that when this passes.

Marilyn A. Maurer (Kalamazoo College): This legislation concerns me greatly. We have some programs where we have athletes in Europe for fall and winter coming back to campus to compete in our spring quarter. Some of the other schools in our league also have the same situation.

Are you saying that if these students who are a regular part of our program, foreign study or career-development quarter are off campus in the fall that they will be ineligible for winter and spring sports?

Mr. Eason: If they are off campus, you cannot declare them ineligible there.

. Ms. Maurer: They are enrolled in the college program. The way the legislation reads now concerns me greatly. I believe there are other Division III schools that have the same kind of programs.

David T. Nelson (Luther College): I came prepared to vote against this until I read this interpretation If I could comment on what one of the previous speakers was saying. The word "or" is in this interpretation. An individual who is not recruited or who has not participated previously.

The way I read that is that you can use the second part of this, and any new student at the institution who is going out for baseball, wait until baseball season starts before they report for practice. So I don't see the students being treated any differently than they are this year.

I appreciate the interpretation. Perhaps an interpretation would also come forward that would accommodate the problems stated by the previous speaker.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): I want to

follow up on Dave's comments, which I think are right on target. But I also would like to give you a little bit of background based on the discussions that took place within the Council in bringing this legislation forward.

Originally, there was no amendment-to-the-amendment. When it was expressed to the Council that this was going to cause some hardship for Division III and Division II and, in fact, for many Division I sports that may not start until later in the season, the compromise position, and I underline the word "compromise," was to come forward with the amendment-to-the-amendment.

As we held our discussions this past Sunday, the Division I members of the Council recognized that this still will create some hardship on Division II, Division III and some of the Division I programs. They are amenable to making an adjustment in the future. Unfortunately, because of legislative deadlines there is nothing that we can do right now.

What I want to clarify for you—if you don't know who is going to go out for your team or if that student is not on campus, you are not going to be expected to have them sign a form. I think there is a little bit of logic that goes along with this. There has to be a body associated with signing the form. At some point we are going to need more clarification about the question that Chuck asked in regard to having the parents sign it. I don't want to try to interpret from the floor. But again, trying to use some logic, if it is asked that the student sign the form, I don't know that the parents signing the form would still be subject to the same date restriction.

I would encourage you very strongly in the spirit of cooperation to vote yes on the amendment-to-the-amendment and vote yes on the amendment. Your steering committee will come back in the future with something that will allow for a division-by-division adjustment to this. But we don't have that opportunity right now.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Reconsideration of Dates of Competition— Division III Women's Volleyball (108)

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: I would like to ask for reconsideration of Proposal 108.

[The motion was seconded.]

Jimmy M. Paschal (University of La Verne): I am a member of the Division III Women's Volleyball Committee. We already have gone under a certain amount of reform over the past few years. We dropped from 26 to 24 matches and we have 22 this coming year. To legislate dropping to 20 is a pretty dramatic change in schedule.

Most 1992 schedules have been made and should be received in the NCAA office by January 15 by conference in order that we might review those conferences seeking automatic qualification. To reduce the number of contests that are available to us to play would necessitate rearranging some of the schedules, which can be a problem for an athletics director.

_ 1992 Convention Proceedings 🖏

Reduction of playing dates also will encourage more tournament play, which does not fit into the scheme of things in some geographical locations because maybe there are only 11 teams in that area. If you have one tournament, you play almost all those teams, which then would necessitate some teams moving out of that area, which would be a financial problem for some schools.

I would like to ask you to oppose this legislation.

Association): Our conference supported this yesterday. But after these discussions, we would agree that the motion should be reconsidered and defeated.

Nine-, 10- or 11-member conferences that previously played double round robin will have to reduce their schedules to single round robin, thereby really taking an awful lot of emphasis off conference play. They will have absolutely no opportunity to play outside of the conference. Staying with the 22 gives ample opportunity to institutions to have a double round robin conference schedule with three-out-of-five matches and still be able to play institutions outside of their conference.

Julie Jenkins [Trinity University (Texas)]: I also would like to speak in opposition to Proposal 108. Yesterday we mentioned the North Coast Athletic Conference study. It shows on that study that other sports such as volleyball already have less time demands on the athletes. I feel that the way that our format is set up that we are not abusing the time demands on our athletes.

Another point is that we are one of those schools that is isolated in Texas. We do not have the opportunity to have multiple competitions on a single date. We are the only Division III school in Texas. Our schedule also has already been completed for 1992. I feel that it is a major jump to go from 24 match dates to 20. Divisions I and II have 28 match dates at present. That is about a 30 percent difference in length of season. I would hope that you will keep it at 24 match dates.

John A. Clark (St. Lawrence University): I think we should not lose sight of the fact that this legislation is really aimed at saving money. I don't know a lot about volleyball, but I do know a little bit more about when the same what happened to that sport when it went from 24

Lit completely changed the concept of the sport of wrestling by almost deliminating dual meets and forcing the sport to change the way it thought, into saving money and going to more tournaments. Being a wrestling coach for a long period of time, that completely changed the sport. Although I don't think this legislation is designed to completely change volleyball, I think the drop from 22 to 20 does save money. I think it does offer some more consistency with what we have done to some other sports. It will allow us to look at multiple competitions within the same date.

Carol Howe-Veenstra (College of St. Benedict): I want to remind people that we also have a reduction in place already for next year. Don't forget that we are going from 24 to 22 already and that we are in

Division III Business Session

the theme of reform.

[Proposal No. 108 (Page A-135) was defeated by Division III after a successful motion to reconsider.]

COMMENTS

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): Mr. Chair, I wonder if I might just offer a couple of reflections on the basis of the business to date and then one suggestion. It would be my sense and I think that of other Commission members that the actions taken a year ago with Proposal 39, our basic playing and practice legislation, that that action was wisely taken then and that in activities yesterday and even this morning that we have sustained that basic reform, or as grandpa used to say, "we have taken the high ground and we have held it."

I think that is very important. I think it is also true that in the process of our debate we have encountered a number of wise recommendations that we ought now to try out the implications of Proposal No. 39. It would be my suggestion, and it is only a suggestion since it cannot be binding, that we have a moratorium in the coming year on any further degislation with respect to playing and practice; that we let ride now the legislation we have adopted to see where it takes us.

That is different than saying any one school or conference cannot come forward if they are so inclined and so compelled. But if there is the sense here that we ought to now try Proposal 39 as passed last year and amended this year, then let's see in fact what it means for us and not load up in advance of next year's Convention a number of bills that would force us even before having tested the water to decide how cool or warm it is. I wonder what your view is on this. I have tried it out on a number of commissioners. I think that Judy Sweet and John Harvey, find this a helpful notion. Could I have a show of paddles of how manythink in the spirit of trying it out we ought to hold off on legislation in the coming year? If you would raise your paddles, that would be helpful. Okay. And how many are not so inclined? Would you raise your paddles? And how many don't give a damn? Okay. That is at least indicative that those who raised their paddles did outnumber those who raised their paddles did outnumber those who raised their paddles in favor of the spirit of moratorium.

The second has to do, Mr. Chair, with the question of Division I-AAA and Proposal 34. I apologize for being somewhat tardy at the beginning of this session. I was talking to some Division II presidents.

I think it is going to be a very hotly contested matter. I understand that that was represented here this morning. But I don't think this question has been resolved yet. I believe if we speak to it on its merits and with some passion we do have a chance of changing the minds of some other voting delegates.

As was the case last year with respect to the matter of Division I schools playing down to Division III, I think the debate turned that question. I don't think that people went in with their vote firmly locked in. I would like to believe that that will be true with Proposal 34 and we can prevail on it. So please be there.

It does matter how many people speak. It does matter that we stand

218 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

and say as Division III one after another how important we think this is in behalf of those Division I-AAA schools who otherwise will be homeless. I think someone did say this morning that I personally made a commitment last year to support this. I did.

That clearly does not bind Division III. But it will certainly bind me to argue as passionately as I can in favor of Division I-AAA, which is Proposal No. 34. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): This is some additional new business.

An issue was brought on the floor last year by Sherry Calvert, who I believe is the chair of the track and field committee, with regard to the payments for both indoor and outdoor track and field national championships in Division III and the fact that this is the only national championship that is not covered by the NCAA; that in fact we have to choose three years in advance as to what championship we want the encay to cover for us.

That is a crapshoot because without knowing three years in advance where the championships are going to be, it makes it almost impossible from a business perspective to make a decision about what the proper thing is for your institution to do.

In our case at North Central College, when we had to sign that notice we were hosting for two of those three years. So it made no sense for us as an institution to declare outdoor. It made more sense to declare indoors. And with the fact that traditionally the outdoor championships have been in the Midwest, it made sense to us that it was going to be more cost effective for us to request that the indoor championship be apaid for.

Well here we are in the third year not knowing three years ago that the outdoor championships were going to be in Maine. It is going to cost our institution a significant amount of money. We are not alone in this. I have had an opportunity to talk to several schools from the Midwest. They find themselves in the same situation. I would request the same thing that Sherry requested last year—that we take some action on this.

· In a memo sent out from the NCAA office with regard to another memo that was sent earlier in the year on the distribution of funds from the television contract, it indicates that for championship expenses \$24.67 million was allocated for that. Transportation and per diem for official traveling parties for all championships in all divisions were paid for

Well that is just simply not the fact. The fact of the matter is one is not, and it is the only one that is not. So I would strongly urge the membership to do what I think is the right thing to do. At this point it seems that there is no action that is going to be taken. It has been sitting in a committee for a year. I am not sure why.

By the 24th, which I think is the date on this memo, the Special Advisory Committee to Review Recommendations Regarding Distribution of Revenues would like to hear from its membership. Please write

	^	100	
Division III Business Session	2	. 19	,

to it. I would suggest four options.

One, change the three-year plan so that we know at least in advance. where the championships are going to be so we can make some Au responsible fiscal decisions.

Two-this was the request that Sherry brought up last year-that we split the per diem and use some of that money to help pay for one of st. the championships.

Three, just simply pay for it outright. It is done in every other divisionin every other sport. It does not make any sense that Division III is being held out of this.

Or four, drop indoors altogether in all sports. My personal preference is have them pay for it all. But because we have different people with differing opinions in the room, I would suggest that you write and make? some recommendation. But let's not sit on this thing another year-get

Robert Bierie (Loras College): In September, Loras wrote the NCAA and requested that Bylaws 15.4.6.2, that being academic honor. awards, and also 15.4.7, leadership and merit need consideration, go to 🖫 the Interpretations Committee for an interpretation.

In The NCAA News, Conference No. 16 of October 1, Item 10, the Interpretations Committee did issue a ruling that a student-athlete may not receive an award that meets the criteria of Bylaw 15.4.6.24 without consideration of the student-athlete's need if the award also includes additional leadership criteria.

The reason that we asked for the interpretation was that it was becoming apparent that some of the Division III members, once a student-athlete achieved the 25 or the 1,050 on the college boards or ranked in the upper 20 percent or had a 3.500, were no longer using a consistent packaging formula based on that criteria, but were taking into consideration other factors such as leadership and merit. Also, some were using an institutional test. Some also were using a personal? interview to award institutional moneys/academic honor awards above 1 and beyond the need factor and inconsistent with packaging formulas with other students who had met those three criteria.

The Council in the meeting preceding that was overturned.

My concern, and I think it has to be addressed by the Division III membership, is what is the message when we talk in financial aid that. we wish to convey? Are we back to selective packaging of financial aid?

I think it has to be debated. I think there has to be a message given $\frac{1}{2}$ William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I have

spoken before as a member of both the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference and Franklin and Marshall. I rise to' speak briefly as a member of your Interpretations Committee.

been honored to serve the membership in that capacity. There are three !! from Albany, Jen Shillingford from Bryn Mawr and myself.

Bob has just mentioned one incident. But I would like to bring to your attention something else that has happened in the last few months that Halso have a concern about and want to bring to your attention because I think it is an important enough issue that you have a chance to debate it in open forum if you so choose since we do have some time this morning.

Earlier this year in September, the Interpretations Committee was asked a question by a school and we came up with an answer from the Division III perspective. In the last couple of years, we have tried to frame the Division III response to respect the opinion that the membership has shown in the last four or five years as you have enacted legislation.

Figure 1 personally don't always agree with some of the interpretations that we give. But I feel I am obliged to give them based upon what is in the Manual and what I have heard you as a membership give to us as your 考 direction.

One interpretation that we gave involved how you can communicate with the admissions office regarding students' financial aid. Our interpretation is a direct quote: "A Division III athletics department staff member may not communicate with an institution's admissions department regarding a student-athlete's financial aid package even after the financial aid package has been awarded."

The three members of the committee felt that was a consistent interpretation with what you have done over the last number of years with legislation. That was sent to the Council for its approval. In one of its fall meetings, the Council responded this way and this was published in The NCAA News.

The Council reviewed an interpretation of Bylaw 15.4.9.3 that a Division III athletics department staff member may not communicate with an institution's admissions department regarding a studentathlete's financial aid package even after the financial aid package has 🏖 bëen awarded.

The Division III Steering Committee reported that it had reversed the interpretation with the understanding that the steering committee will review previous financial aid interpretations during its April

think it is important that you understand this is happening. The steering committee is indeed planning to revisit the financial aid Paregulations that govern Division III. It has overturned two recent interpretations that we thought dealt with financial aid regulations as you wanted them interpreted. I'll stop there because I don't want to say anymore. But I think if the body wants a change in the financial aid regulations, this is a wonderful opportunity to stand up and say let's revisit that and let's go back down that road and make sure that what I have been a member of that committee for three years now and have: we are doing is appropriate for today, 1992, and 1993 and beyond.

If you want to maintain the status quo, then let's advise the steering Division III members on the Interpretations Committee—Bill Moore a committee that let's go to what we've got and make sure that we don't atinker with it.

Mr. Carzo: Thank you. But let me say at the outset that the Division is III Steering Committee has already placed that item on the agenda to revisit the whole issue primarily on the basis of what you said.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): I want to digress for one minute. I have been asked a question with regard to the track issue. Where is that right now? Is there anyone here from the championships

committee?

Mr. Carzo: I can answer for the championship committee. It did at the Convention last year take a survey in terms of visual response. There was an overwhelming response to try to use the money in a different way. We talked about three options that were in front of the body last winter.

When we polled everybody, the responses were exactly one-third, one-third and one-third. There was no clear mandate in the response. It left us in a position of not knowing which direction the body really.

wanted to go.

In addition to that, the projection for splitting the money was precedented by what had happened in Division II and the championship committee's reaction to the Executive Committee's budget. That cost exactly doubled when it paid half the money for both championships.

The third part of it that was complicated and kept us from making any adjustments was that the \$3.9 million that we had budgeted was used up. We were locked into keeping and not expanding championships and not incurring additional costs. Our feeling was that if at the end of this year there is flexibility in that money and they are not as expensive as projected, we then could reconsider the issue and review it.

Mr. Johnson: Could you explain what those three options were?

Mr. Carzo: I will try, Walter. I think one was complete reimbursement for one of the two championships. The other was to split it. And the other was to divide the money—reduce all the other per diems by the amount of money that would compensate for it.

I think Marjorie Giles would like to respond to the other issue that we

discussed subsequent to that.

Marjorie B. Giles [Central College (Iowa)]: I would like to speak to the understanding that the steering committee used in reversing the decision. That was a 9-1 vote to reverse that decision.

It is our understanding that academic honor awards must be part of a normal procedure by your university or college. If that procedure includes all students, other factors also may be used in giving academic awards.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Reconsideration of Division III Playing and Practice Seasons— Athletically Related Activities (97)

Lynn Mehl (Occidental College): At this time, I would like to movefor reconsideration of Proposal No. 97. Occidental College voted on the prevailing side. That is a piece of legislation dealing with voluntary supervision in the field events of track and field.

[The motion was seconded.]

1992 Convention Proceedings

is I believe that we have on the books legislation that has been passed in other sports. In looking at this piece of legislation, I believe that it is consistent with other legislation.

I think yesterday for a variety of reasons the delegates were coverwhelmed with a great deal of the legislation and that perhaps we did not attend to as we should this particular piece of legislation, which in fact would be consistent with other legislation in Division III. That is why I am coming before you today asking for reconsideration.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): I also would like to speak in support of reconsideration. I am having a difficult time understanding why we feel it appropriate to give a safety exemption in swimming, fencing, diving and gymnastics and we don't recognize the safety considerations in the hammer, javelin and shot put. I would hope that we can provide the same kind of relief as we did last year.

I think we found ourselves in the same situation last year. We did not have a safety exemption. Then we went back and provided that safety exemption. It is important to note that this is on a voluntary basis. But let's treat our field-events people with the same care as we have done other athletes.

Mr. Carzo: I would like to respond as to what I heard yesterday on the floor. I think there was a concern that it said that the coach may spot or provide safety or skill instruction during these workouts.

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: We defeated Proposals 31, 32 and 33. What we have on the books right now is a track and field season of 21 weeks. If you have indoor track, you have 26 weeks combined for those track and field athletes. I don't see the need to you to you to you have 26 to you have 26 to you have 26 to you have 27 to you have 28 to you have 29 to

Ms. Sweet: John, what if somebody does not have indoor track and field? Your point was if they have indoor track and field they have 26 weeks. But those field-event athletes who only participate in outdoor track and field are at a disadvantage compared to indoor track and field. And the same safety considerations exist.

Porter G. Miller (Earlham College): I would like to speak against reconsideration. I happen to be a track coach. I love the sport of track. Twenty-six weeks probably is more than enough that we need to get anybody ready to run track. I think the group here yesterday spoke its mind. I agree with you. As a track coach, I would urge you to vote against reconsideration.

Mr. Schael: Judy, I understand what you are saying in terms of 21 weeks or 26 weeks—21 weeks if you don't have indoor track. If you have indoor and outdoor track, then you have 26 weeks.

We are not talking about safety. I think everybody in this room is concerned about safety. It is really coaching when you introduce skill into the legislation.

Robert E. Williams (Swarthmore College): I would like to speak in favor of reconsideration. I think it is consistent with what is going on in with other sports. I think we also need to consider liability.

Sherry Calvert (Whittier College): I would like to concur with the

previous speaker and request reconsideration. For those of you who may not be aware or may not be considering this, there are several field events that are contested at the intercollegiate level that are not contested at the high school level, thus resulting in the lower skill levels with which track and field coaches are presented.

The most notable events that Judy Sweet already has referred to are the hammer throw, the javelin throw and the discus event. Because these practices or supervisory activities are in fact voluntary, I wouldurge you to reconsider and ask that you treat the field events of track" and field with the same seriousness and concern that you have treated the swimming and diving athletes.

Ralph Honderd (Calvin College): I would speak against thismotion. It will lengthen the track season.

Also, what is going to happen is the coaches are going to feel that ifother coaches are practicing with their athletes, which it actually is they are going to feel compelled to do this.

If you try to have workouts for your shot putters, your hammer 1 people and javelin people when you don't really have facilities to do it, I think it is going to be more dangerous.

Matthew Leighninger (Haverford College, NCAA Student-Athlete : Advisory Committee): No matter how long the season is -26 weeks or ... 21-you are always going to have some athletes who are practicing or . working out outside of that season.

Twenty-six weeks does not encompass the entire school year. Therealso needs to be some skill expertise given for track because of the uniqueness of the sport. In swimming, your coach is watching someone. swimming and they can jump in and try to save someone who is drowning. In track, there is no way you can jump into the middle of any action. If someone is throwing a hammer, once it is thrown, there is no way you can go and catch it. There is no way you can keep a pole vaulter > from falling off the mat once they have started into the runway.

So there has to be some type of skill expertise, some type of coaching given. I think in Division III our concern ought not to be that there is too much coaching or too much practice by athletes. Safety ought to be our? primary concern.

The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 97 (Page A-125) was defeated.1

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): Going back to the financial aid discussion that we started a minute ago, I was not really totally in sync with what Marjorie mentioned about her response to the gentleman from Loras about the academic honor awards. I would like to give an example of another situation to the membership to see if this is what it wants to happen.

After a recruited student-athlete gets a financial aid package, I think? right now most of us are saying to our coaches that you can have no input into the financial aid process. And that was the way our interpretation was put forward.

That has now been struck down so that your coach can now go to the admissions director and say: "If this young man or young lady does not come to our college, you are going to miss somebody in your class. You *are going to have an enrollment shortfall. I understand our financial aid package is \$2,000 less than somebody else's financial aid package. Why don't you check with the financial aid office to see what we can do about it?"

I think that is what the lack of that interpretation will do. Is that what you want to happen?

Ms. Giles: Bill, I was responding to the second issue that was struck down, which was academic awards. We felt that the legislation indicated as long as you have a procedure at your institution that you should carry it out for all of your students, whether they be athletes or nonathletes.

Mr. Marshall: Does your procedure include consideration of athletcally typed or athletics activity considerations?

Ms. Giles: No. It never can consider athletically typed or athletics

activities as part of your awards.

Mr. Marshall: Do you consider leadership-type activities such as 🗱 captaincies?

Ms. Giles: Leadership-type activities such as student government and that sort of thing may be considered, not athletically.

Speaking to the admissions office, a coach may never ask for a change of an athletics package. Our concern was that sometimes coaches could be helpful in explaining packages and supporting the package, not speak to a financial aid officer to change that package.

Mr. Marshall: Don't you think by highlighting the differential that there is a hidden message that we best do something to change our spackage if we are going to be competitive with the other school?

Ms. Giles: I cannot speak for every institution. I suppose that could happen at some institutions.

Mr. Marshall: Is that what the membership wants? Here is a chance to express yourself.

Robert Bierie (Loras College): Let me elaborate on what Marjorie is saying and break it down into a simpler scenario.

We have two prospective students. Both score a 25 on the ACT. Neither one meets either of the other two criteria, but our class rank and GPA is somewhat similar. Now we are asked by the institution to write an essay.

Because I write a better essay, we are both no-need students. One gets \$10,000. One gets \$5,000. That is not what you are telling me because once you meet any one of the three, other factors come into play. No longer is the consistency of ACT, GPA and class rank a factor. I think it is important because at least in our part of the country in the recruiting process, financial aid is the No. 1 factor as to why a prospective student-athlete chooses an institution.

'I think here you have somebody from the Interpretations Committee plus somebody from the Council, two very different viewpoints. I think we need some type of a vote because as you say, Rocco, the Council is going to take it up.

I think there has to be some message from this body. I don't know of a better way than with a paddle vote just to see what direction we want

to go. I think the issue is very simple.

In academic honor awards, do you want other factors entering into the picture other than the three criteria? Marjorie, what I have a problem with under Bylaw 15.4.7 is that it clearly spells out that you cannot use leadership or merit to come into the picture if it takes it above need. So for no-need students, even though they may get an academic scholarship, Bylaw 15.4.7 at least tells me and our people that those factors cannot come into play.

Thomas M. Kinder [Bridgewater College (Virginia)]: We have debated this for some time. We thought we had something on the books that Bill Marshall indicated. Now we are going to open this up again.

I think everyone here has gone through this several times. We know what we have at this point in time. Why do we want to revisit and reopen?

Ms. Giles: I would argue that we don't know what we have at this time because people are interpreting it very differently. And there are many awards. In talking to our steering committee, I would say many institutions are considering other things for people who are capable to have academic awards.

I also would indicate to Bob that Bylaw 15.4.7 is not speaking to people with academic awards. That is a different situation altogether.

Mr. Carzo: Bob, would you like us to take a message?

Mr. Bierie: Yes. I think it is important.

Mr. Carzo: Can you simplify it for us? Then we can have a show of hands and see if we want to go ahead. Why don't you go ahead and simplify the message you would like the steering committee to have?

If we get a show of hands to support that, we will record it and bring it back to the steering committee and deal with this issue as long and as

hard as you like.

226

Mr. Bierie: In accordance with Bylaw 15.4.6.2, academic honor awards, the only criteria that can be used in awarding a prospective student-athlete are ACT/SAT, class rank and GPA. No other factors can be taken into consideration. In other words, the consistency of the academic honor award has to be based on those three things.

Mr. Carzo: Is that what you people want to vote on? Whether or not you want that message to come back to the steering committee for that

interpretation to take place?

Nancy L. Mitchell (NCAA): I think Rocky just said it appears that that is what you would like. You would like for the membership to say whether or not they agree that that is the way that this should be applied. That with academic honor awards, you should have no other criteria considered other than what is listed in Bylaw 15.4.6.2, whether or not the membership agrees with that view.

Mr. Bierie: That is correct. Thank you.

u.

_____ 1992 Convention Proceedings

Ms. Mitchell: So it would seem that that would be what you would take a vote on—whether or not you agree that there should be no other criteria included in academic honor awards.

Amr. Carzo: Is everyone clear? That is the message that you are asking us to take back to the steering committee. All those in favor of that message please raise your hands. Opposed. It looks like we got the message. Thank you.

James Dimick (St. Olaf College): I came here with a great deal of respect for President Howard. I am going home with a lot more respect for President Howard. I want people to know that the baseball coaches are probably falling in line with reform. But I guess I would want the body to know that I don't think the baseball coaches that I heard in Dallas a week ago would want a moratorium on possible increase in games because we think, just like the volleyball coaches, that we were at 50 slashed to 45 slashed to 40 and now we are at 36. I don't think that the baseball coaches feel that this would be right.

3. I have heard one word more than anything else. That word is erosion; erosion of the reform plan. I think if we had baseball coaches from all of our institutions, they would talk about the erosion of the right to play the game.

Carol Howe-Veenstra (College of St. Benedict): I have a question regarding Proposal 94 that we passed yesterday with preseason soccer scrimmages. Since we have no formal starting date of competition other than a similar practice starting date of August 24, how is this preseason soccer scrimmage actually applied?

I am a little confused as to this legislation. If somebody could help

clarify that for me, I would appreciate it.

Ms. Mitchell: I know that this legislation was not intended to move back the starting date for practice. That was an interpretation that came out of the Council. Therefore, if your starting date for competition and your starting date for practice are the same, it would seem—others who were at that Council meeting may want to help me here—that you cannot go back before August 24 for those three scrimmages. So basically, what you are talking about is if your first contest date is after August 24, say it is the 31st, then between the 24th and the 31st you can play those three scrimmages, but you could never go back beyond or before August 24 to play those three scrimmages.

Rosalie Resch (University of Chicago): I apologize for returning to the academic honor award. We have taken a straw vote.

However, I wanted to create a scenario for you that you have sent a message that will no longer be allowed. You have a student who happens also to be an athlete who has a 1,400 SAT composite, is first in his class, student government president, math team, a number of other activities.

He gets an award. It means that every other student with a 1,400 SAT and first in his or her class also must get that award even if he or she is involved in no other activities at all in high school.

We have a number of students who come to the University of Chicago

vision III Business Session	227
THE STATE OF THE S	 2.2.1

with 1.400 SAT's who are first in their class. You are now saving that 30 every one of those students must get an academic honor award if one student who happens to be an athlete gets one because of their. widespread activity, city symphony or a number of other activities.

Every other student must get one. Because they are an athlete, you disqualify that individual who is outstanding in a wide variety of extracurricular activities. That is what you have just in your straw vote said. I don't know whether or not that was the intent of this group.

COMMENTS

Ms. Sweet: Mr. Chair, I have been at the microphone more times than I had planned to and more times than I had hoped to, but if you will allow me one more opportunity. I would like to speak as president of the NCAA, as a member of the NCAA Council, as a member of the NCAA Executive Committee, as director of athletics at the University of California-San Diego and as a member of Division III. I hope I am not going to start coughing.

I would like to direct my remarks to you, Mr. Chair. This meeting concludes your term as vice-president of Division III. In earlier comments, your colleagues on the steering committee commended you

for your leadership and your sense of humor.

I would like to go one step further than that. We have seen demonstrated in the past couple of days how you have used those skills to provide Division III with a forum for open discussions, fair debate, an. appreciation of the viewpoint of others, an opportunity to disagree without being disagreeable, ultimately resulting in the determination of what the membership feels is right for Division III.

Earlier in the week. I overheard a conversation where some people were talking about what the outcome of the legislation at this Convention was going to be. One person indicated that all of the minds had been made up before they came to this Convention and in fact we

probably could have faxed in our votes.

I think that in the past two days we have demonstrated why we meet to debate the issues, to listen to each other and to make decisions. Rocky, thank you for the leadership that you have provided to Division III and for making all of this happen.

Mr. Carzo: Thank you.

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): Thank you, Judy, for doing much more eloquently one half of the job that I have to do. I join in great respect and admiration for our chair and vice-president and what he has done. I am to say a couple of words about the other departing member of our Council, Jen Shillingford.

Jen and Rocky have been a twosome since I have been involved with this body. The wisdom and sincerity and their pursuit of the right thing to do for the institutions of Division III and the student-athletes of Division III are not only admirable, they are monumental.

These are some very class people and some giants in their institutions. My notes were to remain short and sweet, and I think that might describe the two people. Rocco, our chair, may be the shortest of the two.

And definitely the sweetest of the two, Jen Shillingford. Thank you.

Mr. Carzo: Thank you very much. I appreciate that enormously in terms of your expression. I heard a person on the Executive Committee conclude her tenure by saying it was a very fulfilling experience. I thought that is a good word to remember. But I really was not fulfilled. I was overflowing with the experience that I had here. You are all such nice people that I really appreciate it.

No matter what I say, it would be very trite. So it would be kind of stupid to say how much I grew and how much I learned and what a great time I had. I think you all know me well enough now to know that

I have a good time wherever I go.

So I would really like to close this the way my grandfather and my father would close a meeting. If you all just imagine you have a glass, we are going to have a toast. Just hold your hand up and repeat after

34 In Italian when you do this, you say salute. Repeat that, salute. Buona fortuna. Cent'anni. Before you drink. I want to tell you what you said. Some day, Rocky is going to have hair. Then watch out.

Salute means your health. Buona fortuna means good luck. Cent'anni means 100 years, and that is as high as you can go. Thank you. It is my pleasure to turn the gavel over to an outstanding person who will do a great job for you, John Harvey.

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.]



Wednesday Morning, January 8, 1992

The Division I business session was called to order at 10:15 a.m. by Douglas S. Hobbs, NCAA Division I vice-president.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Hobbs: The Division I business session is now convened. I will be with you for the next 10 or so hours unless you are very good; and in that event, things can be shortened considerably to our mutual advantage. On the dais with me is the parliamentarian, the venerable Alan Chapman. As mentioned yesterday, he has been parliamentarian for 18 years. Prior to that, he was the president of the Association, which is a more remarkable accomplishment since he was 17 at the time (Laughter)

I have several announcements to make. First of all, a number of amendments have been withdrawn. Nos. 17, 40, 71-2, 73, 77, 80, 121, 123 and 140-1 have been withdrawn

[NOTE: The procedure for voting was approved.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Core-Curriculum Requirements

R. Gerald Turner (University of Mississippi): As chair of the Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 14.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would increase from 11 to 13 the number of academic core-courses a student must complete successfully to establish initial eligibility, and it specifies that two additional core-course credits be earned in English, mathematics or a natural or physical science. The proposal is based on the belief that the successful completion of additional core-courses in these areas will better prepare prospective student-athletes for achieving academic success at the collegiate level.

We believe that the proposal's effective date, August 1, 1995, will permit an adequate time period to permit prospects in high schools an opportunity to adjust to the legislation prior to its implementation. This proposal has been endorsed by the Knight Commission, as well as by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, American College Testing, College Board, the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, and the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics. On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I urge adoption of Proposal No. 14.

Frederick E. Gruninger (Rutgers University, New Brunswick):

220			
230	 1992	Convention	Proceedings

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I rise to speak in support of this proposal and to clarify why it is different from the Knight Commission's recommendation on the same subject. As many of you know, the Knight Commission has recommended an increase from 11 to 15 in the minimum number of core courses. The sponsors of Proposal No. 14 recommend limiting the increase to 13, because research conducted by the Academic Requirements Committee indicates that high schools in many states may not be able to offer more than 13 core courses by August 1, 1995, which, as you know, is the effective date of this proposal. Accordingly, this proposal limits the increase to 13 courses but also specifies that the two additional courses must be in the traditional fundamental disciplines of English, mathematics or natural science. As a member of the Council and also the Academic Requirements Committee, I encourage the delegates to vote for this proposal.

william B. DeLauder (Delaware State College): I rise to strongly support Proposal No. 14. Of all of the proposals presented here today to strengthen academic standards, I believe that increasing the number of core courses will have the greatest impact on increasing academic sperformance and graduation rates. This is the one proposal that is strongly supported by research. Studies by the College Boards show a direct correlation between SAT scores and the number of academic courses completed especially between the math SAT and particular math courses.

More significantly, a recent study completed under the auspices of the College Board shows that for African-American students, the two best parameters for predicting success in college are (1) some indication of an early desire to go to college, generally by the sophomore year in high school, and (2) completion of key academic courses, in particular algebra and geometry. I would, in fact, favor further strengthening of the academic-core requirements and going a step further and specifying the particular math courses that are required—in particular that algebra and geometry be required.

Many of our students do poorly on the SAT tests not because of lack of ability but because of lack of exposure. Many of our students do poorly in college because they lack the exposure to particular academic subjects in high school. This proposal addresses these deficiencies in an appropriate way that is supported by research, and I urge this delegation to support Proposal No. 14.

George Montgomery (Arizona State University): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 14 and strongly feels that Proposal No. 14 will require high-school student-athletes to take higher academic curriculum courses. We feel this, in turn, will allow the student-athletes to enhance academic preparedness prior to college enrollment. More importantly, it will establish a more serious academic approach during their college career.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I would like to ask a member of the Academic Requirements Committee if they considered including social sciences and languages as additional courses.

Division I Business Session	2	2
-----------------------------	---	---

Lorna P. Straus (University of Chicago): I am chair of the Academic Requirements Committee. Yes, we did consider it, but the research to which our colleague has referred gave us considerable confidence that additional courses in English, mathematics and science would be the most significant ones. In addition, I would like to expand on what has been said about the look that we took at the requirements for a high school diploma in many of our states. The requirements for a high school diploma in many states is disappointingly low and the number of kinds of courses that are required for that diploma fit the pattern we sput in our recommendation, which has become Proposal No. 14.

Mr. Rienzo: Is it therefore to be assumed that at a later date there would not be the addition of social sciences and languages?

Ms. Straus: I don't think anything is to be assumed, Mr. Rienzo, I believe that what we are looking at is what kinds of courses are required in the high schools and what kinds of results those students have.

[Proposal No. 14 (Page A-11) was approved by Division I, 312-6, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

Initial-Eligibility Index

Thomas K. Hearn Jr. (Wake Forest University): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal, effective August 1, 1995, will do two things. It will establish an initial-eligibility index based on the core-curriculum grade-point average of 2.500 and SAT of 700 and ACT score of 17. The academic-performance study indicates that for student-athletes generally, an equally weighted core-curriculum grade-point average and the standardized test scores predict academic success in college, that is graduation, better than any other eligibility criteria.

Second, the proposal specifies that the parameters of the index shall not go below the current minimums of a 2.000 grade-point average in the core-curriculum and the combined 700 on the SAT or 17 on the ACT. It is important for the delegates to know that Proposal No. 16 is endorsed by the Knight Commission, the College Board, which supervises the SAT scores, the American College Testing Service, as well as by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions. Officers, and the National Association of Collegiate Admissions Counselors. I certainly urge on behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council that you adopt this proposal.

We talk about this proposal primarily in terms of loaded words like "access" and "opportunity." We need to ask ourselves, access to what? "When we have that conversation, we need to bear in mind that we must be as concerned about access to the classroom as we are about access to the playing fields. These standards will support educational success; and educational opportunity. But opportunity for whom? Should not these wonderful opportunities to play a sport and get a college education go to those students who have demonstrated that they have the capacity to benefit from this opportunity?

We surely know that the issue is not whether minority young people will be given these scholarships—they will—but whether the scholarships so awarded should reflect athletics and academic achievement. Now, we can debate these particular standards forever, but education is ultimately about evaluation and judgment. These standards have been carefully considered by the Academic Requirements Committee, endorsed by the major testing organizations and considered by the Presidents Commission and Council.

They add the GPA, which permits the reflective judgment of many teachers and various subjects over several years, and avoid the excessive reliance on a particular test score. These standards are minimal and achievable, and a student who can make a 2.000 can make a 2.500 if they commit themselves to do so. If, in the history of a young person's athletics development, some coach or some friend were to say you are good enough, don't work so hard, you don't need to practice so much or struggle or labor so diligently to achieve your potential, that awould be tragic advice. In the academic domain, which is infinitely more important in the lives of these young people than their athletics achievements, they need that same message about the quest for excellence and what excellence demands. This is a small but significant step in sending the message that to achieve your best demands your best, whether that is in games, in school or ultimately in life.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the nation is watching to see whether this Association will be part of the national effort to raise academic standards and to affirm above all the promises of the educational mission of the university as it pertains to student-athletes. I urge this body to support this proposal and to follow the lead of the leadership of this Commission and the leadership of the NCAA.

Lorna P. Straus (University of Chicago): I wish to speak in favor of Proposal No. 16. This proposal would increase the minimum corecourse grade-point average required for initial eligibility corresponding to a 700 SAT or a 17 ACT score from 2.000 to 2.500. It would be effective August 1, 1995. Available evidence supports the contention that a core grade-point average value of 2.500 would have approximately the same screening effects as the 700 SAT score or the 17 ACT score. Accordingly, it is this relationship between the core grade-point average of 2.500 and the SAT score of 700 or the ACT score of 17 that defines the basis of the index values established in Proposal 16.

The proposed increase is based in part on the research results available from the academic-performance study. These results indicate that nearly all of the screening effect in terms of ineligibility of Proposition 48 occurs because of the requirement of the minimal SAT score of 700 or a comparable ACT score and that the core GPA requirement of 2.000 has only a small additional screening effect. The Council and the Presidents Commission believe that it is desirable to reduce the emphasis on the test score and to increase the importance of the core GPA in determining initial eligibility.

It is important to note that the initial-eligibility index described in

this proposal and printed in the Official Notice is incomplete inasmuch as it is our intent and that the gaps between the increments in the index as it is printed be filled in. The index, if adopted, will specify that for each 10 points increase in a prospect's SAT score, the corresponding core GPA average decreases by .025. The index will also make comparable adjustments for students who present an ACT score.

This more complete index, which is fully supported by the academic performance study, has been approved by the Council and should have been circulated at the start of the business session. Those of you close to me can see what it looks like. I don't know if everyone has seen it. It is available. On behalf of the Presidents Commission, the Council and the Academic Requirements Committee, I urge the adoption of this.

legislation.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I am the chancellor at North Carolina AT&T State University and a member of the original Presidents Commission. I am urging a vote of "no" on Proposition 16 relative to initial-eligibility indexing. The wording, as recommended by the NCAA Council and the Presidents Commission, a sounds good. The suggestions on the basis of research that "an equally weighted average of a student's core-curriculum grade-point average and standardized test score predicts a student's academic success in college better than alternative initial-eligibility variables," I would submit might very well be a fact that remains to be seen.

Aside from that, it is my contention that insufficient time has expired relative to the availability of ultimate research results that could lead us to a conclusion on an absolute basis. We currently are involved in taking under advisement not only the student's initial SAT scores pegged at 700, but we also consider the student's honor point average on 11 core-courses mandates and suggest that it must reach the threshold of 2.000. Why we would now suggest that the youngster who had a 2.000 honor average produce a 900 SAT is beyond me. Arithmetically, we seem to be creeping ever so gradually but forcefully into the arena of over-emphasis on SAT test-score results.

As we know, the purpose for which these tests were originally developed was not that concerned with student progress but instead predictability for academic success in college during at least the initial freshman year. Why are we now, therefore, suggesting this predictability factor must be more heavily weighted than was the case, say, four or even five years ago? What, as a matter of fact, is so sacred about a 900 SAT score as proposed here under the umbrella of weighted eligibility factors as opposed to the initial 700 at a threshold of 2.000 as an honorpoint average on the one hand as opposed to the 2.500 on the other?

I would submit that there might very well be something basically wrong with these efforts as designed to index ourselves into a more adequate mechanism designed to predict freshman academic achievement success. Again, we perceive, after five years of experience, that the current system works. It is not broken, so why are we attempting to fix it? We need a "no" vote on Proposition 16.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): On behalf of the Commission and the Council, I wish to address the fact that the index does not extend below an SAT score of 700 or an ACT score of 17. In its report to the Commission and the Council, the Academic Requirements Committee stated that no strong statistical basis existed for the use of any particular single minimum test score. The committee believed its report, including this proviso, was consistent with its charge as stated in Proposal No. 58 last year to develop an eligibility recommendation based on research results for consideration by the Commission and Council. Nothing in Proposal 58, however, bound the commission or the Council to consider only the research results in Edeveloping an academic-reform package.

In endorsing the indexing concept as expressed in Proposal No. 16, the committee expressed the view that the floor of 700 on the SAT or 17 on the ACT should continue to exist for the additional eligibility requirements for student-athletes in Division I institutions. The basis for this view likely differed across the membership of the Commission and the Council. Some may have been concerned about Congressional public relations and public reactions to perceived reductions in academic standards in this age of reform of intercollegiate athletics. Others may have independently concluded that the few student-athletes whose tests score below 700 or 17 have a reasonable prospect of earning a college degree in Division I institutions. Concern about the design or limitation of the academic-performance study could also have been factors that induced the decision on the Commission and the Council to support this legislation.

Whatever the individual or institutional motivations were to support a minimal SAT score of 700 or a minimum ACT score of 17, the Commission and the Council continues to strongly endorse Proposition No. 16. I believe that such support is consistent with the existing NCAA elegislation and the reform environment in which the package of academic reforms is being considered at the 1992 Convention. I urge

Your support of Proposition No. 16. Thank you.

William B. DeLauder (Delaware State College): Mr. Chair, I rise to roppose Proposal No. 16 and I do so for four reasons. Number one, it is not supported, in my opinion, by relevant and unambiguous research. This is especially true in the case of the black student where research indicates that even though relatively high SATs may be very predictive, low SATs are not as predictive. This proposal is not even, in my opinion, supported by the NCAA academic-performance study. The basis for the 2.500 GPA, as I understand it, is to choose a GPA that has that same screening effect as the 700 SAT. One can always achieve higher quality by eliminating students; but in the process, one also limits access and opportunity.

Secondly, the proposal does not address the fact that black athletes with low SATs graduate at significantly higher rates than whites with comparable SATs. The NCAA study shows that the graduation rates of Blacks with SATs of less than 700 was nearly five times the rate of

whites with SAT tests of 500.

Thirdly, the proposal does not recognize the diversity of our institutions. In some of our institutions, our professors do, in fact, teachiundergraduates. In some of our institutions, students are provided a nurturing and supportive environment, which allows students with academic ability and potential but lacking high SATs to be educated and to graduate.

Most importantly, fourth, this proposal disproportionately affects, black students. The NCAA study shows that 53 percent of black student-athletes had GPAs of less than 2.500 and 62 percent of black student-athletes have SATs of less than 700. Furthermore, the study shows that the combined 2.500 and 700 SAT will eliminate more than 70 percent of the black athletes versus only 18 percent of white students athletes. This is clearly a discriminatory proposal. If institutions exhibited the highest integrity, this proposal would be unnecessary.

All of our institutions have admissions standards. These are standards that should be consistent with a mission of a given institution and should be based on the predictive criteria for success. One of the important principles stated in the Knight Commission report is, "The admissions of student-athletes will be based on their showing reasonable promises of being successful in a course of study leading to an academic degree. That judgment will be made by admission officials."

If the NCAA institutions complied with this principle, this proposal would be unnecessary. The problem here is a lack of good institutional integrity; and because of this lack of integrity, it is the student-athlete who is exploited and punished. I find it incredible to believe that given the national decline in the number of black students entering college, and especially given the national crisis in a decline of the black male, that this Convention would enact legislation that will further limit access and opportunity for African-Americans and, in my opinion, in an arbitrary and unsupported way. For these reasons, I urge rejection of Proposal No. 16.

Eddie M. Jones (Grambling State University): I don't know if you know it, but I am a bit miffed because it appears as though what we are trying to do is cosmetic in nature. I am a little nervous and a little upset about this, because we say that everything we are doing is for the betterment of Johnny, Susie, Sam or Sally. But, in effect, it is not. As I have studied the NCAA legislation, it constantly says that the studentathlete may not get any more than any other student gets at the institution, yet constantly we insist that the student-athlete perform better than any other students at the university.

The student-athlete has to go to practice, which is expected, he or she has accepted a scholarship. The student-athlete has to go to whatever sessions that follow. That is expected. A student-athlete has to perform on the field. That is expected. But what is expected of the institution? I was particularly pleased when the NCAA gave the institutions the money for a tutorial program, because it then placed the onus upon the institution to do what it should have been doing.

that there were A, B and C sections, that invariably I got students who were in the C section. There was a test, a pre-test as well as a post-test. The highest score was 180. Those teachers who taught the A and B sections got those students making 160 and 170 on the pre-test. I, however, got those students who were making 25, 30, 40 and 50 on the pre-test. At the end of the semester, those individuals who were in the A and B sections made only maybe 10 points better on the post-test than they made originally. My students, coming in with 20, 30 and 40, and 130, 140. The proof is in the pudding.

It doesn't matter how they came there, necessarily, but what do you do with them once they get there? Now, there are a number of ways of circumventing the system and you know about the ways. You have people who go in and take tests for students, change the IDs and the student gets in and does absolutely nothing, and you float him through. Why don't you take the initiative to do what you ought to do? You, of course, benefit from it at the end of the game on Saturday night, on Monday nights or Thursday nights, or whatever nights. You get the money and you are happy because it helps you with the budget, and you don't insist on the student-athlete doing what he or she ought to do for that three years or for that four years, depending upon how the student entered. You don't want to do anything once the student gets there. I am a firm believer that the NCAA member institutions can do what they ought to do with a student coming into college to get him or her to where she or he ought to be at the end of that four or five years.

The dot to be there. You serve no purpose. Why not just let the student come in at the beginning of the year, give the student the textbook, give him the outline or give her the outline and say something back at the end of the semester and take the test? We need to get our act together. We don't need to prove anything to the nation. We need to prove something to ourselves. My 11-year-old told me something about five years ago. I told him to do something and he didn't do it, and I was ranting and raving. I said, "I am the daddy." He said, "Uh-huh." What if I am the daddy? I don't have to rant and I don't have to rave. I just need to do what I ought to do. That is what the member institutions need to do.

Benjamin E. May said, "Let us not segregate or integrate ourselves out of existence." We are going to do this; and if we don't do it, the student-athletes for the most part who we are going to bring in are not going to fill the coffers at the end of the year. I believe that we are going to come back and we are going to acquiesce and come back to exactly where we are at this particular point. Then we are going to decide that we need to do something.

As institutions, we need to have tutorial programs. We need to insist that they go to them. Put forth the same vim and vigor as academicians that the coaches do to get the students ready for the weekend. You CEOs show us you know what you need to be doing, that you can do

what you ought to do by imposing upon your faculty members what they ought to do. Don't just come here and do it cosmetically. I appreciate your time and effort.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I would like to address this proposal before us on academic standards. While realizing it is impossible to discuss any particular element of academic standards without addressing all of them, I think it is important for the Convention to understand that because I disagree with this particular proposal. It does not mean that I oppose the work of the Presidents Commission nor does it mean that I oppose appropriate academic standards. In fact, it would be in Georgetown University's best interest athletically if we would initiate arbitrarily at this Convention academic standards of 1200 in the SAT, 3.000 GPA in a core-curriculum of 18.

I am told we are looking for appropriate national standards, which I personally believe is impossible to attain in this complex heterogenous world of American higher education. You will remember that in 1983; this Convention, at the urging of an ad hoc committee of presidents, instituted 700 in the SAT and a 2.000 core-curriculum grade-point average. We also instituted a five-year study to determine whether the hypothesis of 700/2.000 was appropriate or not. In May 1991, I received a letter from the chair of the Academic Requirements Committee whostated, "The research does not support limitation of a cut-off scores within the index."

I am really concerned that we are proceeding based upon what is politically correct rather than what is academically sound. Recently, Michael Tranghese, commissioner of the Big East Conference, received a letter from one of the consultants of the Presidents Commission. I would like to quote from that letter: "Aside from the research data, I think it is necessary to recognize that with 700 having become established as a cut-off score, going lower would send the wrong message." Not doing what is educationally sound will send a worse message? Going further in that letter, he writes, this is the consultant: "I expect the Presidents Commission to oppose Proposition 17," which is a later proposal, "although the decision will not be made until the Commission meets in Anaheim. This proposal sponsored by your conference is no more and is perhaps less founded on empirical research findings than the initial-eligibility package endorsed by the Commission."

I was so moved by that last paragraph that I do agree that No. 17 is no more and perhaps less founded on empirical data. Therefore, the Big East Conference has decided to withdraw No. 17 in order to encourage the Presidents Commission to adopt the spirit of Proposal No. 27 to provide in an understandable manner the research data that supports their academic recommendations and, thereby, ensuring access to education for those who have the least opportunity and the greatest need. Therefore, I request respectfully that the Presidents Commission withdraw No. 16, because the effective date is not until 1995, and that they work together with the presidents and the CEOs of the historically

black schools to arrive at an appropriate academic and initial-eligibility standard that is consistent with the needs of all of the citizens of this country. I request that the presidents respectfully withdraw it, or, lacking that, I request that this Convention table this motion and let us come back and do it in the right way next year. Thank you.

Jerry Kingston (Arizona State University): I am the faculty athletics representative from Arizona State University, and I am a member of the Academic Requirements Committee. The speakers a few moments ago expressed a particular concern about the impact of Proposition 16 on the ethnicity composition of our Division I sports teams. I would like to speak a moment to that issue. Of all of the research results that the Academic Requirements Committee looked at during this last year, perhaps no set of results was more disturbing than the apparent impact of Proposition 16 on the ethnicity composition of our Division I scholarship athletes.

We were so concerned that we even went back to the NCAA Research Committee and the NCAA research department and we asked them to document for us what, in fact, happened to the percentage of black athletes in Division I in the years before Proposition 48 was passed in 1986, and then what happened subsequent to that time. The research results, I think, are quite revealing in this regard. In 1984 and in 1985, approximately 24 percent of the scholarship athletes in Division I were black student-athletes. This, of course, was for two years before Proposition 48 was introduced.

In 1986, that percentage was reduced to 19.2 percent, a five percentage-point reduction. By 1987, one year later, the percentage of black athletes in Division I had gone back to 21.2 percent and by 1988 it had returned to 23.0 percent. And even perhaps of greater interest is the fact that in the sport of football and in the sport of men's basketball, the percentage of black athletes in Division I was actually greater in 1988 than it was in 1984. What, then, could possibly account for the tremendous difference in these percentages as opposed to the numbers that were being generated by the simulations based upon the academic-performance study?

The academic-performance study was based on five cohorts of student-athletes drawn over a five-year period from 1984 through 1988. Of all of those five cohorts, the ones that are of greatest relevance to evaluating the effects of Proposition No. 48 are the 1984 and 1985 cohorts, because the students in those cohorts were not subject to Proposition 48 so that we, in the simulation—you then expose/impose the Proposition 48 requirements on those classes—divide those classes hypothetically into eligible and ineligible categories, and then track through five years the graduation rates of both of those groups.

In fact, the reason that the differences between the simulation results and what actually happened when Proposition 48 was introduced in 1986, is that the 1984 and 1985 classes were not subject to the requirements of Proposition 48. Many students in those cohorts did not take the ACT or SAT test, and if they did and did not receive what was

238

later a certified test score, they had no motivation to take the test a second or a third time. Secondly, it is the case that the 1984 and 1985 cohorts had no particular academic motivation to take more core courses, to concentrate on those sorts of things, because it was not going to impact their athletics eligibility when they entered into a Division I institution. By way of contrast, the 1986 cohort knew since their sophomore years that they were going to be subject to the 2.000 GPA in] the core and the 700 on the SAT. High-school guidance counselors, parents, student-athletes responded to that. So that when the 1986: cohort entered Division I institutions, we did not find a high percentage of black student-athletes being screened out as a result of the Proposition 48 requirements.

A third reason for the profound difference between the simulation. results and the actual reality of the imposition of Proposition 48 is the fact that to the extent that some black student-athletes were held? ineligible in 1986 under the Proposition 48 requirements, it is quite clear that they were replaced by other black student-athletes who were academically prepared to enter Division I institutions. As a result, there was not an ethnicity substitution in our Division I sports teams. We have this information for the introduction of Proposition 48 in 1986, and there is no reason to believe that the experience that will occur. when Proposition 16 is introduced in 1995 will be significantly different from that.

I also wish to point out that in the division of the 1984 and 1986. cohorts, hypothetically into the eligible and ineligible categories, the graduation rates of student-athletes held eligible under Proposition 48 were 10 times greater than the graduation rates of those who hypothetically would have been held as ineligible under those same standards. On the basis of all of these research results, I strongly recommend on behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee and the Council, as well as the Presidents Commission, the adoption of Proposition No. 16.

James H. Maxey (Georgia State University): In the area of college selection, retention, that is an area that has been well-researched for a number of years. There is a rich literature base empirically in that area. The research being quoted today is a very limited sampling to that body of knowledge. What I am hearing today supports Proposition No. 15. There is good evidence that reasonable interpretation of data is the grade-point averages, the best single predictor for students, both black and white. The question bothering the conference is that Proposition 16 is discriminatory.

I don't think there is any doubt about it, but that it is. The rationale that I have heard so far, which is a pretty good one, is for the end 700 and 2.500. I would like someone on the committee to explain to me the other end, the 900 and the 2.000. I would like for them to answer specific questions. What percentage of black students who take the SAT achieve a 900? What percentage of white students who take the SAT have a 900? And what rationale is there for saying if you have a 900 and didn't work very hard that motivation and work ethics are not

important as a good predictor? Thank you.

Charles Theokas (Temple University): Every student-athlete's potential for academic success is different. So are their athletics skills and, just as importantly, their backgrounds. Yet, year after year, some college administrators, coaches and some of us in the NCAA seem to forget that intercollegiate athletics open the door to educational opportunities for thousands of young men and women in disadvantaged homes and under-represented populations. The opportunity is a valuable one for the students and their families. It is only fair and right that students interested in athletics competition not be required to meet a standard higher or lower than that required of other studentathletes for extracurricular and intercollegiate participation.

We admit our young people because they are students who are dancers or debaters or athletes. For those in school, educational opportunity should be the primary goal of the admission, not great performances. Each one has the right to know that they are equally valid by their institution for the challenges they face as students. Yet, Proposition 16 negates the value and demands more of some than of others. This is simply unfair.

Will the raising of the GPA requirements really send a message to our high schools to better prepare student-athletes for college work? This may be the lofty stated intent, but the message will hardly have a real impact on the public, urban schools, which have, in the face of shrinking resources, no meaningful way to respond. We all want highschool education to be better and for the students to be better prepared. Yet, limiting a student-athlete's potential to use athletics skills to obtain an opportunity for college education simply will not guarantee the end result of better preparedness for college.

In the end, it will only eliminate consideration of students who otherwise have limited choices of hopes. It will be the student from the high school with the least to offer who will lose the opportunity for the future. I urge you to defeat Proposition No. 16.

Eddie M. Jones (Grambling State University): If you will indulge me for a few minutes longer. With all due deference to the individual who said that the speakers talked with reference to ethnicity, the students that I taught were 50-50.

It had nothing to do with black or white. I don't see black or white per se other than in the selection of my cars. In MacBeth, there is a soliloguy in which MacBeth says, "If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well, it were done quickly: if the assassination could trammel up the consequence, and catch with his surcease success; that but this blow might be the be-all and the end-all here, but here, upon this bank and shoal of time, we'ld jump the life to come. But in these cases we still have judgment here; that we but teach Bloody instructions, which being taught, return to plague the inventor."

MacBeth says, "I have no spur to prick the sides of my intent, but only vaulting ambition, which o'erleaps itself and falls on the other.

Division I Business Session _

"He's here in double trust; first, as I am his kinsman and his subject,

strong both against the deed; then, as his host, who should against his, murderer shut the door, not bear the knife myself. Besides, this, dunking half borne his faculty so meek, hath been so clear in his great office, that his virtues will plead like angels, trumpet-tongued, against the deep damnation of his taking off; and pity, like a naked newborn babe, striding the blast, or heaven's cherubim, horsed upon the sightless couriers of the air, shall blow the horrid deed in every eye."

We need to be careful. We have nothing but vaulting ambition that we are looking at. We have student-athletes who are trusting us and we need to look out for their best interest. A few years ago, the ACT was changed from 15 to 18. Recently, in someone's newfound knowledge we have now moved it from 18 to 17. We hurt a number of students by doing this. Let us make sure that before we make any move that we have done the kind of research that we ought to and that our motives are on the side of the student-athlete.

Brian J. O'Connell (Niagara University): I intend to abstain in this issue and I would like to offer my principal reason for doing that. The motivation for much of the legislation has been the academic-integrity issue. As I see it, the academic-integrity issue is pretty much limited to the revenue sports, not the nonrevenue sports. That is with rare exceptions, as I see it. Yesterday, Dick Schultz, in his address said that much of the problem we have in the NCAA is from legislation intended for basketball and football rolling over into other sports. I believe his examples were about recruitment. I think we should ask whether it should also apply here. Should we separate the revenue sports from the nonrevenue sports as we make this kind of legislation? I would like to abstain so that in the future years we can make that distinction.

R. Gerald Turner (University of Mississippi): Proposal Nos. 14, 15 and 16 had as their goals within the Presidents Commission to try to communicate to students, parents and their schools what it really takes to effectively prepare one's self for a college experience. The ultimate goal is to have as high a probability that one would achieve a college degree after being admitted to our institutions as possible. The general belief is that at a 2.000, we would not tell students in general that that level of performance will prepare you to do college work.

A 2.500 gives a level of performance that also is tied to a greater level of mastery of that material and, therefore, a higher probability of success and greater preparation. The basic idea is that students, just as the data shows with the ACT and SAT, will respond to what is required. If we only require a 1.800, then many will try to do a 1.800. If we require a 2.000, that will be met. A 2.500 will also be met. In so doing, the students will be much better prepared to effectively pursue a college degree and to be among those 99 percent who will not have a pro experience, but will be working out in the world in a nonathletics way.

We urge the acceptance of No. 16 and believe that it is a step in the right direction to effectively communicate the kinds of preparations you need to have to be successful in our colleges and universities.

William H. Harris (Texas Southern University): I am somewhat

Econcerned by the psychology that goes on in here, and I guess there is some learned psychology as well that shows us immediately what would happen if we raised standards and how people will reach them. I don't think there is any real evidence for that. My main purpose here is to ask if it is true that we have done much better since Proposition 48, as numerous speakers have said, why change things now just as they are beginning to work for some unknown reason? I stand to join my colleague from Georgetown University and ask that this motion be tabled.

...Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): I just want to reiterate some of the points that have been made in the last several minutes that I think we should consider in addressing Proposition No. 16. For students who made the standard that we set with Proposition 48, the graduation rate was 10 times higher. The student who made that standard had a 1,000 percent better chance of graduating than the one who didn't. After three years of implementation of No. 48, there was no change in the ethnic and racial mix of our student-athletes.

Students who are given a standard to meet and enough time to meet it, meet that standard. If we set it low enough, they will achieve at low levels. If we set it high enough, we can increase their chance to become college graduates rather than college tragedies. Indexing, the combination of grade-point average and test score, is the best predictor, better than either one by itself. Massive amounts of data from all of the testing associations, all of our state associations, documented that year after year, data that are far richer, stronger and more reliable than the data available to the committee. As a result of that, this proposal has been endorsed by the ACT, the College Board and the National Association of University Admissions Officers.

Ladies and gentlemen, I urge your support for Proposition No. 16. It is academically the right thing to do, the right thing for our students and the right message to get our students to prepare to become college graduates. Thank you.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I would like to apologize for misleading my colleague from Texas Southern. I guess I should have asked to have this proposal referred to committee rather than tabled. I so move that it be referred to the Academic Requirements Committee and the NCAA Research Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

Jerry Kingston (Arizona State University): As a member of the Academic Requirements Committee, I rise to speak against this motion. We have in the academic-performance study data at this point and have had throughout the entire year the most relevant portions, the portions from the 1984 cohort and the 1985 cohort, upon which the analysis of our evaluation of Proposition 48, and then also Proposition 16, was made. If we were to wait an additional year, we may gain the information from the 1986 cohort. The 1986 cohort information has been filtered. All of the students who entered Division I in 1986 were already subject to Proposition 48. We no longer have an unfiltered

sample of data upon which to perform simulation analyses, and I contend that a referral to committee is just perhaps one other way that someone might be trying to table this motion or obviously to move it away from our vote today. I strongly urge the delegates to vote against this motion.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I rise to speak in favor and to support strongly and to urge the delegation in support strongly the motion as duly seconded to have this referred to the appropriate Academic Requirements Committee of the NCAA structure. The eloquence of the person from Georgetown is apparent with regard to this proposal. It certainly is more than just a faint questioning of the validity of the research upon which this proposal has been presented by the Presidents Commission. As a former member of that Commission, I would urge strongly that we just simply cannot afford to pass legislation wherein a questionable doubt has been raised in relationship to the validity of the research base. Therefore, on that basis and in concert with that position, I am urging the delegation support to have this proposal referred to committee.

James Leutze (University of North Carolina, Wilmington): I respectfully disagree with my colleague from the University of North Carolina A&T State University. I think it would be very unfortunate if we did not act in a definitive way on this proposal at this meeting at this time. I believe that the research has been very careful. I trust the people who have done this and I trust the Academic Testing Services that support it, and I would urge that we do not let this cup pass. I would not vote for this motion to refer this back to committee. I think that is a delaying tactic and I am opposed to it.

Thomas K. Hearn Jr. (Wake Forest University): The honest and honorable thing to do about the proposal, ladies and gentlemen, is to vote it up or down. The men and women who have devoted hundreds of hours to studying this proposal, which has been washed through every major educational testing organization in the country, suggests that the only purpose of this proposal is not further information but simply a method of defeating the proposal without having to vote against it. Let's vote it up or down. I oppose the referral to committee.

William B. DeLauder (Delaware State College): I rise to support the motion to refer Proposal No. 16 to the Academic Requirements Committee and despite all of the clarifications given on the NCAA academic study, there is no definitive research to support Proposition No. 16. On the other hand, Proposal No. 14 is supported by research, and that is why I supported No. 14 and opposed No. 16, and I think that we need to refer it back to the Academic Requirements Committee.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 16 to the Academic Requirements Committee was defeated 55-263, two abstentions, roll-call vote.] [Proposal No. 16 (Page A-14) was approved by Division I, 249-72, five abstentions, roll-call vote, after a motion to refer was defeated.]

Official Visit Prior to Early Signing Period

Fylincent J. Dooley (University of Georgia): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

Fnow move the adoption of Amendment-to-amendment No. 18-1.

tac [The motion was seconded.]

The amendment-to-amendment will adjust the effective date of this legislation from August 1, 1992, to August 1, 1993. This delay in the effective date will allow adequate time for prospective student-athletes or for potential early signees of the National Letter of Intent to adjust their academic plans to the new requirements. I urge your support of this amendment to the amendment.

[Proposal No. 18-1 (Page A-18) was approved by Division I, 288-34, two abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Mr. Dooley: Proposal No. 18 addresses a specific concern that has been brought about by the National Letter of Intent's early signing period. Some prospective student-athletes are signed to a National Letter of Intent just as their senior year of high school is starting, and it is unclear whether these athletes will qualify academically for participation through their freshman year in college.

There are no academic requirements for institutions participating in the National Letter of Intent program to follow concerning the signing of these athletes. Proposal No. 18 will prevent a member institution from providing an official paid visit to prospective student-athletes who have not achieved the minimum test score on either the SAT or the ACT examination and who have not successfully completed at least seven required core courses.

Achieving these standards indicates that the prospective student-athlete has a reasonable expectation of completing the required core courses before graduation from high school. Currently, some prospective student-athletes are taking official visits and signing National Letters of Intent when there is no chance they will qualify for participation during their freshman year. The adoption of this proposal will permit member institutions to allocate recruiting funds in a more efficient manner by establishing a more complete academic profile of prospective student-athletes who might sign a National Letter of Intent during the early signing period.

Susan H. Murphy (Cornell University): While we support the intent of this legislation, we would urge a "no" vote so that the matter may be properly received at the Convention next year. The way the legislation is currently written, it would prohibit a visit from a student who appeared to be an obvious qualifier based upon his or her performance on the PSAT or the PACT, but has not taken the official SAT or the official ACT as a high-school junior. Those students who could not, therefore, present a score of 700 or 17 would be prohibited from a visit prior to the early signing date. We believe that language should be included. Furthermore, it imposes what we believe is a demanding burden of proof of the academic requirements by requiring

S	(A)	Division I	Business Session

the official transcript and in the Form 48-H, as indicated in the interpretation.

We would like to see language written that is not so imposing of an administrative burden on our high-school colleagues or our athletics departments. Therefore, we would urge a "no" vote for reconsideration of this language for submission at next year's Convention.

[Proposal No. 18 (Page A-17) was approved by Division I, 249-74, two abstentions, roll-call vote, as amended by No. 18-1.]

Satisfactory Progress—Mid-Year Transfer Student
Frederick E. Gruninger (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): I
move the adoption of Proposal No. 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 19 focuses on satisfactory progress and the mid-year transfer students. In speaking in support of this proposal, I want to elaborate on the loophole it is designed to address. Currently a mid-year transfer student in the sport of football, for instance, is not subject to the satisfactory-progress legislation at the beginning of the next full term; because at that time, the student had neither utilized a season of competition at the certifying institution nor spent an academic year in residence at the institution. This proposal would simply hold the student accountable for 12 credit hours during each term of attendance at the certifying institution during the initial year of enrollment.

[Proposal No. 19 (Page A-18) was approved by Division I, 316-11, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

Satisfactory Progress—Regular Academic Year
Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): Mr. Chair,
I move adoption of Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

Frederick J. Gruninger (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 20-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This particular amendment responds to the communications that the Academic Requirements Committee has had relative to No. 20 during the process of our efforts to reach the proposals that are before the Convention today. The amendment-to-amendment will permit the Academic Requirements Committee to waive the requirement that 75 percent of the satisfactory-progress hours be earned during the regular academic year. It will permit the committee to assist a student-athlete who does not meet the requirements when the student-athlete's overall academic record warrants the normal application of the legislation. The committees will develop special waiver criteria for granting such waivers and report waiver results to the Council and the membership. This legislation will permit limited flexibility in the administration of Proposal No. 20. It is permissive legislation for which we hope we get your support.

Jerry Kingston (Arizona State University): I rise in support of Amendment-to-amendment No. 20-1. This proposal is consistent with the statements made by Dick Schultz yesterday at our opening session

in which he had expressed his desire for there to be additional flexibility in the administration of what oftentimes appear to be rather rigid frules. It is also consistent with the waiver authority that the Academic Requirements Committee will request that is a part of Proposal No. 21, which is another part of the satisfactory-progress package that is being the Sponsored by the Academic Requirements Committee.

Eddie M. Jones (Grambling State University): I would like to make this observation. It is indeed strange to me that this body—although I am not opposed to it, and I want to state this early, I am not opposed to awaiver when a student has demonstrated previously—it is particularly strange to me that we need to have a 2.500 GPA coming in, etc., and all that we have passed this morning, but now all of a sudden it is fine for a student-athlete to just get 75 percent for the first two semesters. Why can't he or she get the 12 hours? That is minimal. Let's be consistent, either consistently right or consistently wrong.

 [Proposal No. 20-1 (Page A-20) was approved by Division I, 312-13, roll-call vote.]

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): This proposal would discourage the excessive use of summer-school courses for eligibility purposes by limiting to 25 percent, the proportion of satisfactory-progress hours that student-athletes may earn during the summer. It will bolster the student-athlete's role as a student during the regular academic year. It will make athletics administrators, coaches and student-athletes more aware of the fact that considerable attention must be paid to academic work during the academic year if the student-athletes are to retain their future athletics eligibility.

If the proposal is adopted, student-athletes will no longer be expected to be primarily athletes during their term or terms of competition with the expectation that they will make up for that with concentration of academics during the summer. On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I urge that we adopt Proposal No. 20.

Jerry Kingston (Arizona State University): I would like to speak in favor of Proposition No. 20, I first point out that the effective date of this Proposal is August 1, 1992, and that means that there will be no retroactive application of this particular proposal.

Secondly, this proposal helps to address the concern that summerschool enrollment often occurs away from the campus in which the student-athlete is enrolled and may, with some frequency, involve academic work of less substance than courses offered by the student-athlete's institution during the regular academic year. Thirdly, I wish to point out that the proposal establishes a minimum number of hours necessary to meet the satisfactory-progress requirement, and student-athletes who exceed this minimum 75 percent requirement during a traditional academic year would continue to be able to bank the hours earned in excess of this minimum and apply those hours towards the 75 percent requirement during subsequent traditional terms.

The existence of the waiver of the satisfactory-progress requirements would continue to apply on a pro rata basis. In conclusion, the proposal

Division I Business Session

does not prohibit student-athletes from enrolling in summer-schools courses to earn additional degree credits, it simply discourages the use of summer school as an academic cure-all.

Richard C. Hiskey (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): It speak in opposition to Proposition No. 20. As near as I can tell, there is no data to indicate that the intellectual quality of summer-school courses is any different from those in the academic year. Furthermore, those schools that offer nonathlete students the opportunity to attend summer school without any kind of percentage division should, I believe, afford the same opportunity to the athlete-students. It seems to me that Proposition 20 is an encroachment on institutional responsibility. I think that the reform movement has tried to treat athletes the same as nonathletes on campus. I see this legislation as contrary to that notion.

Eddie M. Jones (Grambling State University): Am I to understand that the bank hours will still be used and there are no particular limitations attached to the bank hours? I would like to get someone to respond to that, please.

Mr. Kingston: Yes, there are no limitations on banking hours if hours taken during the regular academic year exceed those that would be required under this 75-percent requirement. So, there would be a banking of hours that could be carried forward. This was the point I made just a few moments ago.

Mr. Jones: What about the grandfathered bank hours? Are we going to afford the student the right to check their bank account of those previously banked hours?

Mr. Kingston: The proposal becomes effective August 1, 1992. As we begin then for the following year to make satisfactory-progress rules or to actually apply this rule to student-athletes after that date, you will hold harmless student-athletes who did not meet that rule prior to the August 1, 1992 date.

Charles E. Knapp (University of Georgia): I rise to support the comments of our colleague from Chapel Hill and oppose Proposition No. 20 as amended. I would only state in addition to what the gentleman from Chapel Hill said that we had a faculty committee at the University of Georgia review all of the academic-requirement proposals before the Convention, and they came out very strongly opposed to this and said it was really up to the faculty of the institution to decide what portion credits might be gained during summer school. In addition, if, as was suggested, our purpose is to keep students from going to other institutions and getting credits of perhaps lesser degree of rigor, then I suggest we address that directly by the legislation and not throw it in with the other parts of the amendment.

William H. Harris (Texas Southern University): I join my colleagues from North Carolina and the University of Georgia in opposing this amendment. The only reason this amendment would make any sense is that the university faculties would say we do less in our summer-school classes than we do in our regular classes. If we admit that, then what

s we need to do is to fix what we do in our classes and not put a burden on our students.

I also think that what we have said in this reform movement is we are trying to do everything we can to make it possible for student-athletes to graduate. If they get courses that can enable them to graduate and they can get them during the sessions that we teach at our universities by our faculties, it ought not to be any business of anybody else at what time of the year they take those. I strongly oppose this amendment.

Frederick J. Gruninger (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): I just want to clarify one point. The primary focus of this is the accountability during the normal academic year. It is not necessarily in relationship to going to another institution. That is where the committee has zeroed in on this particular proposal.

There have been many institutions that have come forward and said we should have done this on a semester basis or a quarter-by-quarter basis. When the committee looked at this in our first approach, we felt that we needed to look at it, if you don't mind the word, as a compromise because we all looked to the accountability in the normal academic year where our student-athletes should be focusing time in the classroom and not to catch up with an unlimited number in the summer. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 20 (Page A-19) was approved by Division I, 260-66, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

[The Division I business session was recessed at 12:10 p.m.]

Wednesday Afternoon, January 8, 1992

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with Douglas S. Hobbs, NCAA Division I vice-president, presiding.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Satisfactory Progress—Fulfillment of Degree Requirements and Minimum Grade-Point Average

. Stanley O. Ikenberry (University of Illinois, Champaign): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 21 is a key element of continuing-eligibility proposals recommended by the Academic Requirements Committee and sponsored by the Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council. Part A of the proposal, effective for students who enroll first on or after August 1, 1992, will require student-athletes to have completed 25, 50 and 75 percent of their degree requirements prior to eligibility certification during their third, fourth and fifth years of college enrollment, respectively.

The legislation that requires 50 percent of the student-athlete's degree requirements be completed prior to the fourth year of enrollment was adopted, as you recall, in the 1991 Convention for Division I athletes. The proposal, we believe, will help overcome deficiencies that exist within the current satisfactory-progress requirements, and it is

endorsed by the Knight Commission and we believe it will strengthen the eligibility requirements considerably. So, on behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I urge its adoption.

Peter Likins (Lehigh University): On behalf of the Patriot League, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 21-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Peter Simis (California State University, Fresno): I would like to move that we split Nos. 21-A and 21-B.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

I would like to speak against Proposition No. 21-A. I think it is bad legislation. It is discriminatory in terms that it makes our students choose between academics and sports in a way we have never had them do before. This is a section where the students don't have the same satisfactory-progress requirement. Those who take more demandings majors, such as engineering, with 140 units, will have to have more units to remain eligible than those who just major in eligibility. It really doesn't touch those who are majoring in eligibility. We have a maximum number of electives. The students to whom this legislation is aimed will be football and basketball players who continue their progress there. I believe that No. 21-B, and similar GPA requirements, get to this issue much better.

Furthermore, the 75-percent restriction really hurts legitimate students. Most of our students change majors once in their career, and students who change majors late in their careers would not be eligible. Students who transfer in would have to meet this for eligibility or would have to shop for new institutions. I guess it is not fair to those students at all.

There are a lot of administrative questions as well. It is just a nightmare. Basically, the composition of No. 21-A is not needed. The 50-percent requirement that is already there really has not kicked in yet. It will take care of a lot of the concerns we had before with junior college transfers. I just urge you to defeat No. 21-A and maybe support No. 21-B.

Lorna P. Straus (University of Chicago): As chair of the Academic Requirements Committee, I would like to describe a little bit more about what Proposition 21-A would do. In particular, we have received questions about what the percentages apply to, so I would like to give you an example. Suppose the student-athlete declares a major in history in the beginning of his third year of enrollment in accordance with current NCAA requirements that a major be declared at that time. Suppose further that that student-athlete's institution catalog states that 120 semester hours are required for that major. The 25-percent rule requires that prior to eligibility certification for the third year, the student-athlete must have not more than a total of 90 hours remaining to complete his or her degree, 30 hours or 25 percent of the 120 hours having been completed.

Similarly, the 75-percent rule would require that not more than 30 hours remain prior to eligibility certification for the fifth year. It is

n 30 📑 🐔 It ie important to emphasize that the 25-50-75 percentages apply to the total minimum hours required to complete a degree, 120 hours in our required, and do not apply separately to the specific courses or hours required by the specific major field, department or college. I would like also to emphasize that this applies to junior college transfers and to four year institutions. They have to declare a major at the time of the beginning of their work at the four-year institution, their third year, and the 25-percent rule would apply.

In other words, 30 of the 48 transferrable hours, which have to have been accepted by the four-year institution, would have to apply to the program the student has declared. The junior college transfer who meets this rule would then be immediately available to compete at the four-year institution.

I urge your support for this rule. It is a way of having the studentathlete progress on a regular basis toward the degree program that he an she has selected.

Jerry Kingston (Arizona State University): This proposition simply represents an extension of the principle of satisfactory progress that was adopted by this Association one year ago. At that time, the rule that 50 percent of the degree requirements be completed prior to the fourth year of competition, in fact, is already a part of our legislation, and the 25 and 75 percentages represent simply an extension of that same principle. I would like to point out again, because the Academic Requirements Committee spent many, many hours on this sort of proposal, our current satisfactory-progress requirements do not require that during the first two years all of the hours earned will apply to a specific degree program. As a matter of fact, during the freshman and that each course taken by itself must apply to some degree program. Soffered by the university.

As a result of the time the student currently declares a major at the beginning of the third year, it is entirely possible that that student is a long way from receiving a university degree. It is also the case that in the junior and senior years, even though our current legislation requires that each of the courses taken at that point will count towards the award of the student's degree, in fact, students may change majors and may do so frequently, oftentimes with the requirement that in order to go into the new major they have to sign up for prerequisite courses and lower-division courses that must be taken before the upper-division courses, and that new major, in fact, can be taken.

As a result, our current satisfactory-progress requirements continue to allow students to major in eligibility; and the Academic Requirements Committee was given the strong direction by the Presidents Commission to develop criteria and to develop a satisfactory-progress standard that would indeed ensure that the students were making progress toward the specific degree.

I also wish to point out that if, in fact, this proposal is adopted, it will probably negate the requirements of having a junior college core-course

250			
400	 1002	Convention	D
	_ 1272	Canvenna	Proreading

requirement established. As a matter of fact, in the early thinking of the Academic Requirements Committee, we were giving serious consideration to that and in our first meeting with the Presidents. Commission we received a strong negative view of that particular approach and we were requested to go back and develop an alternative approach that would avoid the necessity for developing a whole separate set of core-curriculum courses for the junior colleges that would tend to have the same sorts of effect. Under the 25-percent rule as professor Straus has just described, for a JC transfer coming in at the beginning of the junior year, declaring a major at that time, 30 of the 48% hours that the student brings in from the junior college must apply toward the specific degree program that the student-athlete has declared as the junior year begins.

This is an absolutely critical component of the package of proposals that have been developed by the Academic Requirements Committee and endorsed by the Council and the Presidents Commission and L.

strongly urge its defeat.

Eddie M. Jones (Grambling State University): If, in fact, and we all realize it is contrary to fact, and is in the subjunctive mood, if we are concerned about the student-athlete graduating, if we are going to mandate that they do all that we think that they can do, and if we set the standards high enough for them to get the 900 or the 700 or the 13 core courses, then we also ought to set the standard high enough once they get there. I urge that we support this and not only 1.800 grade, point average this time but 2.000 next time so that they will graduate at the end of the four or five years, if you are really concerned about them graduating. If you are not concerned about them graduating, then let's reverse all that we have done and let's stop playing games.

[Proposal No. 21, Part A (Page A-20) was approved by Division I, 270-48, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

Peter Likins (Lehigh University): I want to be clear. We need No. 21-A as well as No. 21-B even if our legislation (Proposal No. 21-1) fails. We think that in No. 21-B there are some unintended consequences. We think we can refine the legislation. No. 21-B is written not in respect to the diversity of our membership. That is a challenge. In the NCAA for continuing eligibility, a student-athlete must, according to No. 21-B; approach the GPA required for graduation in his or her own institution at a prescribed minimum rate, achieving, for example, 95 percent of the institution's graduation GPA for the third-year eligibility and 100 percent of that GPA for four- and five-year eligibility. Every league is different, but this legislation would have an unintended effect in the Patriot League and perhaps in your league as well.

The purpose of Proposal No. 21, as I understand it, is to improve graduation rates, particularly for those student-athletes who use up their athletics eligibility. You save this up over years, and then have every expectation of completing the academic programs. I acknowledge that improvement is necessary in this general domain and in some institutions. But, to my knowledge, only one student at Lehigh

University in the past decade has failed to graduate after four years of competition in any one of our 23 sports. That one student eventually will graduate if we can keep the pressure on him. Other members of the Patriot League have similar kinds of records. We really don't need more NCAA rules to make us do the right thing. In particular, we don't need rules, that hurt our kids.

It is not unusual for a student-athlete or, in fact, any student in our institutions to complete the demanding academic program by our standards, only in the final semester or maybe in an extra semester completion of a semester or two late. We encourage all of our students will take on challenging courses without undue inhibition to our grades. We offer no empty courses that can be used to pump up grade-point average. Proposal No. 21 would deny eligibility in the senior year to the student who began the year, even one percent below the graduation standard. We don't penalize other students for such approach to success and we should not penalize students who are also athletes.

Our amendment, No. 21-1, does not change the spirit of Proposal 21, but it does remove the burden from students who are on the path to graduation in our league and perhaps in yours. Juniors, supporting No. 21-1, would be eligible if they achieved 90 percent, not 95 percent of the graduation GPA, and seniors would require 95 percent, not 100 percent of that standard. Our Patriot League experienced that students who do meet the lower criteria do graduate almost invariably and we see no need to deny them the benefits of athletics competition. Thank you.

Joe B. Wyatt (Vanderbilt University): Mr. Chair, I rise to support this amendment. At Vanderbilt, satisfactory progress in grade point is calculated at 1.800 for juniors, 1.900 entering the senior year and 2.000 for graduation. Passing No. 21, unamended, would mean that varsity athletes at Vanderbilt would be held to a standard higher than all other students. At the present time the graduation rate of our athletes is actually a bit higher than all other students. The fact is that many students who enter their senior year with a 1.900 are able to graduate with a 2.000. So, we think that requiring a 2.000 for entry into the senior year is unnecessarily restrictive and, in fact, would be unfair in terms of the varsity athletes at Vanderbilt. So, I support Amendment-to-amendment No. 21-1.

[Proposal No. 21, Part B (Page A-22) was approved by Division I, 275-38, two abstentions, roll-call vote, as amended by No. 21-1.]

Satisfactory Progress

Steven B. Sample (University of Southern California): I would like to move Proposal No. 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 24 would slightly increase the number of hours, credit hours that a student-athlete must earn in semesters past or beyond his or her freshman year, basically from 24 to 27 hours per year. What we have all found is that the 24 credit hours per year minimum has quickly become the standard in many institutions. As a consequence, many students, when they complete their eligibility after four years, are still

one full year's worth of academic work away from graduating.

By slightly increasing the number of credit hours earned in the years after the freshman year, from 24 to 27 hours, all student-athletes by the time they finish their eligibility would be only one semester away from graduation. In my judgment and in that of many of my colleagues, that will help us achieve our major goal, which is to substantially increase the graduation rates for student-athletes. So on that basis, Mr. Chair, I would urge that we vote in favor of Proposal No. 24.

Richard A. Rosenthal (Notre Dame University): Mr. Chair, I would like to speak in support of this proposal. Obviously, graduation is a process, and the attainment of that process must be achieved in an orderly progression. We strongly favor consideration of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 24 (Page A-27) was defeated by Division I, 148-175; two abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Satisfactory Progress—Remedial, Tutorial or Noncredit Courses

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): I would like to move Proposal No. 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to move Amendment-to-amendment No. 25-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Amendment-to-amendment No. 25-1 is in response to a request by the Presidents Commission to move the effective date of Proposal No. 25 to 1995 to coincide with other academic proposals supported by the Presidents Commission. I believe any discussion about the merits of Proposal 25 I will hold until that motion specifically is discussed.

{Proposal No. 25-1 (Page A-30) was approved by Division I, 299-29 roll-call vote.

The original adoption of the satisfactory-progress rule permitted the use of unlimited remedial hours in meeting satisfactory progress during any academic year. Several years later, in response to abuses of the remedial credits, the legislation was reduced to a maximum of 12 hours in the freshman year. Since 1986, when that 12-hour limit had been in place, we now have the opportunity to award financial aid for freshman students totalling two summers and two semesters to earn 24 hours of credit that first year. We believe that for the students who need additional preparation two semesters and two summers are adequate to earn 24 hours of real college credit.

We are endorsing our present satisfactory-progress rule for students who use courses that are not counted toward graduation requirements and may amount to at least a half year of credit. We don't allow these courses to establish initial eligibility; we should not allow them to maintain continuing eligibility. Today, we have heard over and over that students will meet any standard when sufficient time and notice are given to meet that standard. The adoption of Proposal No. 25-1 has established that time frame. We also speak very proudly about sending a message to high schools, to parents and students about academic preparation.

_____ 1992 Convention Proceedings 🤶

It is now time to listen to our own message and to send the same message to our own students, faculty and the general public that our pathletes are real students in real classes. With the adoption of Proposal 55-1, the Presidents Commission supports this amendment, and your fadditional support is requested.

Burt L. Monroe Jr. (University of Louisville): I rise in opposition to Proposal No. 25. The problem is not sending messages. I do not believe this is good legislation from an academic standpoint. There are numerous institutions that are requiring incoming students to take certain preparatory courses to offset the deficiencies in some subjects, usually based on a battery of admissions tests. This applies to even excellent students with a deficiency in a few particular areas. Currently, the NCAA rule allows up to 12 such hours to be used for annual progress for eligibility purposes. Amendment No. 25 essentially would enable many such students to remain eligible in their sophomore year, because these add-on courses may not have been taken first in their freshman years.

Students are now precluded from offsetting the lost hours in the summer following the freshman year because of the new 75 percent/25 percent. Please also note that there cannot be abuse of remedial courses for overall progress towards a degree because the 25-50-75-100 percent rule we just passed ensures real progress toward the degree after the sophomore year. This is exclusive of these add-on courses, this 25, 50, 75, etc.

Defeat of this amendment will remove the inequity that would exist for these students in their sophomore year. I also understand, and someone on the Presidents Commission will please correct me if I am wrong, that the Presidents Commission took no stand on this issue as it currently stands, i.e., they do not support it even as amended.

R. Gerald Turner (University of Mississippi): The Presidents Commission was going to oppose Proposal No. 25 because we felt that there were some implications that we wished to have researched by the Academic Requirements Committee. The understanding that we have with the sponsors of this legislation was that if No. 25-1 passed, we would remove our objection. We would not actively support it, but we would remove the objection because it would then allow the kinds of studies that we wanted the Academic Requirements Committee to give this proposal—the implications for international students and other things that we felt needed to be researched more carefully. So, the actual position of the Presidents Commission was a removal of our objections if No. 25-1 passed. We didn't agree to put it on our agenda as actively supporting it.

* Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I would take the same position as the speaker who spoke before and would urge, as he did, that we vote "no" on this language. The suggestion of the membership of the Colonial Athletic Association that remedial, tutorial and noncredit courses not be considered by the university in relationship to maintenance of satisfactory progress is absolutely incorrect. It is

moving in the wrong direction.

Additionally, there are those who might even go so far as to say that it is bold-faced discrimination against student-athletes who, for whatever reason, be it poverty or urban unmanagement, or ethnicity or rural isolation, or poor high-school preparation, and in need of extrabella are involved in enhancement courses in academia. These kids just, simply needed additional boosts as in remediation, and notwithstanding the fact that the course work in most universities does not perhaps a count ultimately towards graduation. That has nothing to do ultimately with their eligibility for counting as far as satisfactory progress, is a concerned.

Therefore, I would say let the individual institutions and their faculties make this acutely academically related determination as to what counts and what does not count with respect to the maintenance of satisfactory progress. The Colonial Athletic Association clearly oversteps, I think, its bounds as far as sheer governance is concerned when it attempts to dictate faculty, institution's specific prerogatives as associated with eligibility criteria related to the maintenance of satisfactory progress, whether or not remediation course work should count as a part of same.

William H. Harris (Texas Southern University): Mr. Chair, I stand to urge that we vote against this proposal, especially in light of what we did with the Amendment-to-amendment No. 25-1 and the clarification from the Presidents Commission. If it is true that the Presidents Commission shares the same misgivings about this as I do at this point; and why not have the study done that No. 25-1 asked for and at the appropriate time then ask us, given the study, to vote. Passing of No. 25-1 does not carry with it a commitment that this matter would be brought back to this body for its decision. That must be done for it to be requitable. I urge you to vote against this until we know what No. 25-1 produces.

Martha O. Chiscon (Purdue University): I want an interpretation? of what a noncredit course is because there are courses that are noncredit in a particular degree program but are fully accredited in other degree programs. I want to know how that course would fit into this legislation. I can give you a specific example. The specific example is that in the school of science at Purdue University about half of our students enter unable to begin the first calculus course, and the first calculus course is the only mathematics course that is acceptable for graduation in the school of science. Yet, precalculus is acceptable as a perfectly valid college-level math course by a number of other schools of the university. I want to know whether that course, and courses like it, are interpreted as being noncredit and fall into this category.

Mr. Yeager: I believe in that example that course would count. We are talking about courses that don't have any progress toward any degree

Ms. Chiscon: I think that is part of the problem with the wording of this particular proposal. There are many situations like this that need

to be fully clarified before we vote "yes" on this proposal.

Charles S. Harris (Arizona State University): I move to refer Proposal No. 25 to the Academic Requirements Committee for the study that has been alluded to previously.

::[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 25 (Page A-29) was referred to the Academic Requirements Committee, 274-50, roll-call vote.]

Two-Year College Transfer Eligibility—Nonqualifier

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): On behalf of the Big Ten Conference universities and other sponsors, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 26.

is [The motion was seconded.]

4. This proposal is intended to assist nonqualifier student-athletes who transfer to our four-year colleges and universities from a two-year college to successfully complete their academic work at our institutions and graduate. If this proposal is adopted, the nonqualifier student-athlete would not be able to compete in the first year after transfer. This will assist the nonqualifier student in adjusting to the demands of the educational program at the new institution.

"Under existing junior college transfer rules, the student could immediately receive financial aid in practice. The nonqualifier junior college transfer student-athlete will still have two years of eligibility remaining. Eligibility years one and two will be in the junior college and in year three, in the first year after transfer, the student will not be eligible to compete but can practice and receive financial aid. The student will be able to compete in years four and five. In addition to providing the nonqualifier transfer student time for transition to the educational program of the four-year institution, this proposal will place the incentive of competition in years four and five, encouraging the student to stay in school and complete his or her degree.

Dennis A. Farrell (Big West Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Two-Year College Relations Committee, I wish to speak in opposition to the adoption of Proposal No. 26. The NCAA Council and the Two-Year College Relations Committee are committed to strengthening academic requirements for two-year college transfers. However, this proposal, if adopted, will have a negative impact upon two-year college transfers. Instead of providing an incentive for individuals to perform well academically in a two-year college, this proposal, if adopted, would provide a roadblock to their progress.

With the other academic-requirement proposals that have been considered at this Convention, the Council and the Two-Year College Relations Committee believe this proposal is unnecessary. Further, this proposal could have the negative impact upon student-athletes who performed well academically at a two-year college but did not take the standardized test during high school because his or her intentions at that time may have been different. This proposal will have a negative impact not only on those high-profile sports but on all sports for both men and women. Before this proposal is adopted, adequate research

should be done to indicate that the graduation rates among two-year, college transfers would be tremendously enhanced by requiring two-year college transfers who were partial or nonqualifiers to fulfill an academic year of residence before being eligible to compete upon transfer to a Division I institution. I urge its defeat.

Eugene Trant (Virginia Commonwealth University): Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in opposition to this proposal. I think we are saying something dramatic to our colleagues in the community colleges by voting in favor of this, and it is not a good thing. Those of us who have to deal with state legislators on a daily basis where they are telling us that English 101 in the community college, if not now, should be shortly the same as English 101 at state universities. We are going to have an enormously difficult time explaining this in our various states. I think this is bad legislation, and I think that the prior proposals have solved the questions of progress towards degree and, therefore, I urge that this be defeated.

R. Gerald Turner (University of Mississippi): As most of the membership knows, in an early edition of the Presidents Commission's agenda for this Convention, this proposal was part of our preliminary evaluations. In fact, at our April meeting we had tentatively accepted it but asked the Academic Requirements Committee to look at addressing the issue of movement toward a degree and solid academic courses among junior college students in another way. They came forward with a proposal that we have just passed that requires 25 percent of degree requirements to be passed before one's third year of academic enrollment. That is the reason we then dropped our support and endorsement of this proposal. The Presidents Commission feels that the legislation we just passed addressed most of the concerns that we had. Therefore, we have not endorsed this particular proposal.

Arthur W. Cooper (North Carolina State University): I rise to support Proposal No. 26. In the many years I have been teaching at the college level, I have found that the transition from junior college to a four-year college is frequently very large. The academic program that I manage, in which we get many junior college transfers, often takes a student an extra year to catch up with his peers in the regular four-year curriculum. The same problem frequently exists with student-athletes in regard to academics. Proposal 26 will maximize the likelihood that a student with a weak high-school background and who may or may not have rectified those weaknesses in junior college can succeed in the same degree at a four-year school.

Samuel H. Magill [Monmouth College (New Jersey)]: I would go on record as opposing this proposal, and I am in accord with the comments that have been made by others in opposition. I would simply like to add my concern that this proposed legislation is so sweeping in its nature, its character, that it does not take into account those institutions that have worked very hard to develop carefully devised matriculation agreements with community colleges, which are based upon a great deal of competence in the academic standards of institutions involved.

To penalize students who have gone through a rigorous program at a two year college in this fashion, I think would be most unjust. I oppose this legislation.

Bonnie Slatton (University of Iowa): I would just like to remind the delegates that this only affects nonqualifiers. It does not affect all junior college transfer students. One speaker asked that we gather data. In the Big Ten we did that, and we found that less than 20 percent of the nonqualifiers graduated from our institutions. So, we felt that in the interest of providing an experience in graduating junior college transfers, we had to impose this rule. We think it is in the best interest of the student-athlete.

[Proposal No. 26 (Page A-30) was defeated by Division I, 98-225, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Financial Aid—Summer School

Voseph S. Boland III (Auburn University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 67.

ች ሾ [The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would amend the current restrictions that apply to summer school financial aid for incoming freshman student-athletes. The awarding of financial aid to a student-athlete to attend an institution in the summer prior to the student's initial, full-time college enrollment, the recipient shall receive athletically related financial aid only in proportion to the amount of athletically related aid that the student will receive during the succeeding academic year and shall become a counter during the succeeding academic year. This proposal will allow the institution an opportunity to provide such financial aid regardless of need or aid available to all students generally. We believe this proposal is academically sound inasmuch as it provides opportunity for incoming student-athletes to become familiar with academic addemands prior to the start of athletics competition in the fall.

There are two primary arguments against this proposal that have been advanced in the past. The first is that it will add cost to financially strapped athletics departments. In that regard, however, it can be argued that this is the case of an ounce of prevention being worth a pound of cure. Providing student-athletes an opportunity to get their feet wet academically prior to rigorous competition may diminish the need for summer sessions and the argument for increased financial aid would be moot.

Concern has also been voiced that relating the income will be a ploy to conduct preseason practice activities. While this concern may have been legitimate a few years ago, we believe that with the development of more effective compliance programs, monitoring systems are now in place to help prevent this from occurring.

At this Convention, we have passed satisfactory-progress legislation, namely the 25-50-75 percent rule, and the GPA requirements that are more restrictive than that for students in general at most institutions. Having done so, I believe that we have an obligation to provide whatever support we can to give student-athletes an opportunity to

succeed. As stated previously, Proposal 67 is sound academic legislations and I urge you to vote the package.

Frank Windegger (Texas Christian University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I wish to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 67. The NCAA Presidents Commission sponsored Proposal No. 30 for this Convention, which clarifies its intent in presenting legislation regarding summer school aid that was adopted by the Convention in 1990.

At the 1992 Convention, Proposal No. 30 provides substantial opportunity for incoming student-athletes to receive institutional financial aid to attend summer school by allowing athletics funds to be used for this purpose. At the same time, Proposal No. 30 emphasizes that the awarding of financial aid to incoming student-athletes for summer school is an institutional decision to boost the student? athlete's academic prospects by stipulating that such aid may be awarded on the basis of criteria applied to all students.

Proposal No. 67 contains no such similar protection. In addition, the proposal introduces a measure of uncertainty by requiring that summer school financial aid be awarded in proportion to the amount of athletics-related aid that the student will receive during the succeeding. academic year. The prospect of such speculative awarding will lead inevitably to confusion when the awards for the succeeding year may not be known at the time summer school aid is awarded, given the uncertainties associated with the Pell Grant award and some institutional grant awards outside of athletics.

This proposal also would require the recipients of this type of summer school aid to become counters during the succeeding academic year per NCAA Bylaw 15.5. This also introduces some potential confusion inasmuch as it is conceivable that a student-athlete might receive aid during the summer prior to the initial enrollment and for a variety of reasons decide not to enroll in an institution following the fall term.

On behalf of the NCAA Council, I urge your opposition to Proposal No. 67.

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): I wish . also to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 67. This proposal, I will remind everyone, is an exact repeat of Proposal No. 84, which was defeated last year, and for all the same reasons should be defeated again. The focus of my concern is also the terminology and requirement that subsequent awards must be in proportion to awards given during the summer. This, of course, presents no problem for those institutions that provide full grants-in-aid to all student-athletes and intend to provide full funding for whatever expenses the student may incur in the summer. For many of the rest of us, there is danger. For example, an interest in paying tuition for a single remedial course in the summer prior to enrollment limits the subsequent year grant-in-aid. There is no clear definition as to what constitutes a full or equivalency scholarship for the summer term or a summer school period.

Aside from the proportional issue, current rules already provide for

the opportunity to give nonathletics financial aid to such incoming student-athletes. In response to the proposed legislation, why should it be permissible, or better yet, why is it necessary to utilize athleticsrelated funds for this purpose? Passage of No. 67 will only cause Confusion and result in greater costs. I urge you to oppose it.

Jeffrey A. Howard (Georgia Institute of Technology): I am a member of the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Our *committee strongly supports this proposal because of the direct benefits that this opportunity gives to the student-athletes. By allowing an incoming freshman to receive full summer school financial aid that had already been awarded to them, the student-athlete can now afford to choose to go to summer school and reap the advantages both academically and athletically. Academically, the advantages are obvious. The student-athlete now has the means to get a head start adjusting to the college atmosphere. Athletically, a freshman can now afford to have access to better and safer facilities that may or may not shave been available in the past to them. It seems obvious to our committee that the benefits of this proposal warrant adoption.

[Proposal No. 67 (Page A-95) was defeated by Division I.]

Summer Financial Aid—Incoming Student-Athletes

Thomas K. Hearn Jr. (Wake Forest University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 30.

[The motion was seconded.]

3 Proposal No. 30 is intended to clarify the Presidents Commission's intentions regarding the legislation adopted in 1990 concerning the type of financial aid that may be awarded to incoming freshman student-athletes for an institution's summer term. If adopted, the current legislation for Divisions I and II would be revised to delete the statement that the student's financial aid was granted without regard to athletics ability and to substitute language that says a studentathlete qualifies to receive such aid on the same basis as other students generally. At the end of that same paragraph an additional sentence would state that the source of these funds to support a student-athlete's attendance in summer school may be athletically related. This language reflects the Commission's original intent that the financial assistance under these circumstances be awarded on the same basis as that for *students generally, and that once the determination to award the funds has been made by the financial aid office the funds can come from athletics sources. Mr. Chair, I believe this is not a controversial proposal in view of the fact that the Convention overwhelmingly adopted this previously, and I urge its adoption.

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): I am not sure I would agree with the previous speaker. I would like to say that I hope that a little extra needs to be said to convince you to defeat No. 30 just as we have defeated No. 67. This proposal, while it was passed in 1990, the proposal before you is exactly a repeat of Proposal No. 28, which we defeated last year. The basic issue again is why should it be permissible, or better yet, why is it necessary to allow for the utilization of athletically related funds to support summer school attendance?

You are reminded that we already provide the opportunity to give nonathletics financial aid to such incoming students. It is another haves-versus-the-have-nots issue and will certainly not contain any more cost. I urge you to oppose this proposal.

[Proposal No. 30 (Page A-34) was defeated by Division I, 140-175. eight abstentions, roll-call vote.

[The Division I business session was recessed at 2:45 p.m. and

reconvened at 3 p.m.]

Full-Time Enrollment—Final Semester/Quarter

Frederick E. Gruninger (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am pleased on behalf of the Council to move the adoption and ask for support for the following reasons. Under current legislation, a studentathlete may be enrolled in less than a full-time program of studies during the final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate program, provided the student is taking the course necessary to complete his or her degree. A student-athlete who utilizes this exception to the fulltime enrollment requirement, however, forfeits all future eligibility. Tomorrow in the general session, Proposal No. 37, if adopted, would say that such a student-athlete does not forfeit all future eligibility provided he or she completes all the degree requirements during the final term and is eligible to receive a degree upon the next degreegranting date.

In keeping with the spirit of the academic reform and the increased emphasis being placed on the importance of student-athletes obtaining a degree, we urge you to adopt this proposal. It truly, truly rewards those students who actually do receive a degree.

[Proposal No. 38 (Page A-61) was adopted by Division I.]

Partial-Qualifier and Nongualifier Eligibility

Lawrence C. Keating Jr. (Seton Hall University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 39-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 39-1 is designed to bring Proposal 39 in conformance with any change or redesigning of the satisfactory-progress legislation. I think that it is probably very similar now since we did not pass No. 27. I think we need to deal with this in the future if this proposal passes. It is simply to keep it in line with whatever the academic progress requirements are of the NCAA in general.

[Proposal No. 39-1 (Page A-63) was approved by Division I.]

Mr. Keating: I move the adoption of Amendment-to-amendment No. 39-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

No. 39-2 is designed to remove objection that was brought forth the last time this proposal was brought up, which passed successfully and then was turned around on reconsideration. One of the complaints was that the attempt by those sponsoring was simply to get athletes already enrolled to be included under this legislation. We recognize the concerns of some of the coaches in this country about that, and we are willing to accept the fact that this is really an issue of not individual student-athletes or athletes currently enrolled, but something that is fair to the entire Proposition 48 issue.

We have asked that the starting date be effective for athletes entering after August 1, 1992. It will not include retroactively any athletes currently enrolled in our institutions.

[Proposal No. 39-2 (Page A-63) was approved by Division I.] Mr. Keating: This is perhaps the third or fourth time Proposal No. 39 has come before this Convention. As a matter of fact, at one point it was successfully passed, as I mentioned before. I think what we are mixing up here in many cases is the issue of Proposition 48 and whether or not the majority of this membership feels we should have Proposition 48 and athletes for our teams who are coming in as nonqualifiers or partial qualifiers.

This is not really designed to address that issue. I think we are dealing with that step by step and; in fact, it may be progressed to the point that we are not going to have any partial qualifiers in the near future. This is to deal with equity issues for those who come in and participate on our teams for three years after sitting out their freshman year and who have proven them academically to the same standards as all the rest of our athletes. I think if you want to deal with the nonqualifiers and partial qualifiers, we can deal with that. We do have them, we have coaches who have used them both as walk-ons and recruited athletes. But it seems to me as long as we are going to have this issue on the books we ought to be fair and equitable.

It pleases me that to this day we have not had a lawsuit come forward from someone in this category challenging why they are not allowed to participate for their fourth year when every other athlete who produces the same academic transcript is allowed to go on and play in his or her

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I stand to support strongly the comments made by the first speaker. I agree with him totally and I would congratulate the membership of the Big East Conference for the decision to urge this assembly to vote yes on Proposal 39. As cited in the narrative, the purpose of the proposal is to simply restore a student-athlete's four-season eligibility after the student has proven his or her academic ability by successfully completing 96 semesters or 144 units toward a specific baccalaureate degree. I happen to agree with the conclusion rendered by the Big East Conference. It seems unfair not to allow these students to regain a fourth season of competition by virtue of sound academic progress k equal to that required by other student-athletes.

These students are the ones, as we all know by now, who, as a matter of record, faithfully made the decision and in concert with NOAA regulations to abide by the law in conjunction with sitting out the initial year of matriculation on the campus in concert with provisos contained in the original Bylaw 5-1-j proposition. Therefore, given the fact that they have studiously undertaken to accept the provisions of this proposition, it is equally fair for us to compensate them for the fact that they have paid their dues.

Margaret Gatz (University of Southern California): I want to make, sure that everyone pays a lot of attention and remembers to vote against this proposal. There are laudable academic purposes, and even the Los Angeles Times supported this proposal. The reason I wish to urge opposition is that there are unintended consequences that it would create.

The proposal would seriously undermine the incentive value of Proposal. The message to high-school students would be those grades and those SAT scores are not as important as we have been telling you fifty you can just stay eligible for four years, we will make sure you get to play that fourth. If there is any move in the directions suggested by this proposal, what I would urge is linking it more clearly to graduation. As in the discussions we have just had about degree tracks, if we can imagine a partial or nonqualifier literally enrolled in final courses they need for their degree while playing that last semester, that kind of control might make sense. Otherwise, I think that what we are going to find short of that is that Prop 48 is seriously compromised and graduation rates will be unaffected.

Barbara Winsett (University of Illinois, Champaign): The Student Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 39. There are student-athletes who do not have the guidance in high school to take the right classes and make the grade to be eligible in our Division I schools. We should give these athletes the chance to prove they are willing as well as capable to achieve as students. If they do prove themselves as students, give back that year of competition to these student-athletes.

Jerry Kingston (Arizona State University): Along with many other satisfactory-progress and other eligibility standards that we considered during this last year, we also, of course, have had the opportunity to look at this particular proposal. Obviously, it was not a part of the package that the Academic Requirements Committee brought forward simply because we continue to believe that this proposal undermines one of the basic incentives that is implicit in Proposition 48.

Student-athletes, as we described earlier this morning, one of the primary effects of Proposition 48 and one of the fundamental effects of Proposal 16, which we have now passed, is to send the message to high-school students, to send it to their parents, to their coaches, to the guidance counselors that you must be academically prepared.

What this legislation will do will be to encourage the recruitment of those who are not academically qualified with the promise that if you Lipst come to us we will fix it up so you get your fourth season of competition. I urge the membership, in light of all of the positive support that we have had for academic reform measures this morning, to defeat this proposal.

Mr. Keating: I would like to, first, thank the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee for taking a stand on this. I think it shows that there is some group among our collegiate sports and universities who understands what we are trying to get to. I also, quite honestly, would like to thank the two members of the Pacific-10 Conference who have expressed the fact we should not keep an athlete eligible so he can get his fifth year. It only points back to the fact that the objection to this is not very well founded.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): Students who come into their fourth year potential of eligibility and who are partial qualifiers are very different people than they were five years earlier. I think that some of my colleagues are seeing gooses here in thinking that we are going to convince people five years ahead of time that we are going to keep them eligible. If these students have come and have proven themselves for three years, four years, and if they can do the work, we ought to allow them to have that fifth year. I am a firm believer in the incentive plan. This will give a strong incentive to those student-athletes to work hard to succeed.

David Bernstein (California State University, Long Beach): I think that in support of this Proposal No. 39, I wish to call the delegates' attention to the fact that this item does not appear in the vacuum and that it is no longer possible, as my colleague from Seton Hall indicated, to keep students eligible. This has been the essence of our reform program. The previous legislation that we have passed makes that very, very difficult, if not impossible now, especially the 25, 50, 100, 150, 200 percent rules that we have been passing. I think that in that context Proposal 39 is valuable and gives the right message to our student-athletes.

[Proposal No. 39 (Page A-62) was defeated by Division I, 153-167, as amended by Nos. 39-1 and 39-2.]

Hardship Waiver—Division I

Dennis A. Farrell (Big West Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

. I would also like to move, on behalf of the sponsors, the adoption of Proposal No. 42-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 42 carries an immediate effective date. Proposal No. 42-1 carries an effective date of August I, 1992. For those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1992, this amendment is intended to eliminate any discussion that Proposal No. 42 would apply on an uneven basis to certain Division I members. If Proposal No. 42, which has an immediate effective date, is adopted without this amendment, certainly Division I institutions might gain

264	 1992	Convention	Proceeding
	 	Convention	r roceeaino

competitive advantages by permitting certain student-athletes an additional season of competition when upon transfer it appeared that the student-athletes did not have an additional season of competition. Therefore, no advantage should accrue to any Division I member with the adoption of this Proposal No. 42, if Amendment 42-1 is adopted. This amendment-to-amendment would also allow two-year colleges at reasonable period of time to adjust to the new provisions regarding the hardship waiver.

[Proposal No. 42-1 (Page A-70) was approved by Division I.]

Mr. Farrell: If adopted, Proposal No. 42 would permit a Division I student-athlete to be granted a hardship waiver based upon an injury or illness that occurred during enrollment at a two-year college. Currently, only Divisions II and III member institutions recognize hardship waivers related to injuries or illnesses that occurred at two-year colleges. The NCAA Two-Year College Relations Committee has learned from the NCAA staff that there has been no single abusive incident at a Division I institution that created the current legislative status in reference to this issue.

However, understanding a potential for misuse of this amendment, in fact, that Division I competition generally involves higher profile athletes at an institution, the Two-Year College Relations Committee has recommended several conditions that must be met in order for a Division I student-athlete to be granted a hardship waiver based on an injury that occurred at a two-year college. For example, the only waiver request that will be considered will be those for which the applicable two-year college athletics association has applied the same or more stringent hardship rules that NCAA members currently utilize. Further, the NCAA member conferences, or in the case of an independent member institution, the NCAA Eligibility Committee must review and approve each waiver request. Additionally, this proposal will benefit student-athletes who have the athletics ability to participate at the Division I level. If adopted, this proposal will allow said studentathletes greater flexibility in selecting an institution that will meet their needs both academically and athletically.

R. Dale Smith (Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference): The objective of this proposal is worthy of consideration. The proposed administrative mechanism still contains two basic flaws, the first of which is timeliness. The final resolution of hardship-waiver requests in the academic year in which the injury occurs is critical to obtaining reliable, complete and objective supporting documentation. The potential two-year delay before review by the Division II conferences is fatal to this effort. The second flaw concerns the source objectivity and completeness of junior college participation records. Division I member institutions are hard pressed to maintain complete participation records in all sports and all events of each sport.

Limited or nonexistent sports information offices and media coverage means that recollection of junior college coaches will be the fundamental basis of these appeals. Do we really wish to rely solely on the coaches' accounts given their vested interest with the involved student-athletes and the four-year institution that plays the student at that college? Many of our own member institutions provide contemporaneous and season-end sports information documentation and not simply a post-season statement from the coach. It is difficult to accept less from the junior colleges. That being the case, I move for referral of this proposition back to the Two-Year College Relations Committee to properly address the shortcomings.

[The motion was seconded and then defeated.]

[Proposal No. 42 (Page A-69) was approved by Division I as amended by No. 42-1.]

Hardship Waiver

Frederick E. Gruninger (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): On behalf of the sponsors, I propose adoption of Proposal No. 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposed legislation would seek to provide a consistent manner of calculating the countable competition under the colimiting rule that we have right now applied to the traditional playing season and declaring the hardship waiver relative to the student-athlete. In our opinion, the scrimmages that do not constitute a game should be counted against the student-athlete if he or she is injured. I think there is one other possibility that we should now take a step back and look at in relationship to this, now that we have capped our seasons—the number of contests that we can play per sport. This just says that obviously those who play in the scrimmage, and if an institution desires to use the scrimmage with an outside competition prior to its regular season, that any type of injury that occurs at that time would not be counted in any hardship waiver that they might like to apply for.

John C. Jessell (Indiana State University): As one of the sponsors of this proposal, I would also like to address the fact that performance records in scrimmages and exhibition contests are not included in team records of wins or losses, and neither are they part of individual statistics. The only major application is with reference to the administration of the hardship waiver and it should not be counted. Counting an exhibition or scrimmage as one of the two events, or in the 20-percent proportion, can result in the loss of a season of competition. This was addressed on Tuesday by our executive director, Dick Schultz, who emphasized the need to be more flexible and considerate in our decisions regarding eligibility. Your support of this proposal would be greatly appreciated.

[Proposal No. 43 (Page A-70) was approved by Division I.]

Restricted-Earnings Coach

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors of Proposal No. 49, I would like to move its adoption. And I would also like to move Proposal No. 49-1.

[The motions were seconded.]

Division I Business Session _

Mr. Chair, the intent of these proposals is to provide the athletics

	1992	Convention	Proceedings
--	------	------------	-------------

departments at each of our Division I member colleges the opportunity on a limited basis to compense a maximum of two of its allocated restricted-earnings coaches for performing essential duties in the department, in addition to coaching. Many of our athletics departments currently employ such coaches in administrative capacities as facilities managers, business managers or physical education instructors, all of which is legitimate employment and must be so documented in the office of the athletics director. The Amendment-to-amendment No. 49 appropriately restricts each member to so employ only one such coach in a men's sport other than football and basketball, and only one such coach in women's sports other than basketball, which is consistent with the cost-containment and goals established at this Convention.

Stanley O. Ikenberry (University of Illinois, Champaign): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge we oppose the adoption of Proposal No. 49. In the 1991 Convention, the Division I membership adopted legislation to establish the restricted-earnings coach category. The legislation was the result of a reform package designed to reduce athletics department spending by reducing the number of coaches associated with each sport. Further, the establishment of a restricted-earnings category was designed to encourage the development of new coaches by limiting the compensation that could be provided to such coaches. The adoption of Proposal No. 49 would result in increased athletics department expenditures and could, in fact, deterthe development of new coaches, thus eroding the intent of the legislation passed last year. I, therefore, on behalf of the Presidents Commission urge that we oppose the option of this resolution.

Richard G. Jaeger (Dartmouth College): I would like to speak in support of the amendment. We currently have a number of tasks that must be performed in our departments. They are already on the budget. We removed this opportunity for our people and we have to give the jobs to others. It is not fair to the coaches who currently occupy these positions and it is a limited number of individuals who will be involved.

Joan C. Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): This proposal allows flexibility within our staffs to best utilize our personnel. It is restrictive and it can only be one in men's athletics and one in women's athletics. It is doing what Dick Schultz suggested on Tuesday, that we can have different rules for sports other than football and basketball.

This will allow a female minority to have a position within our staff. I think it is a way to best utilize our staff.

[Proposal No. 49-1 (Page A-79) was defeated by Division I.] [Proposal No. 49 (Page A-78) was defeated by Division I.]

Restricted-Earnings Coach

Thomas A. Spragens Jr. (Duke University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the sponsors, I move acceptance of Proposal No. 50.

The motion was seconded.

This proposal, Mr. Chair, represents a piece of fine-tuning that makes good sense. It does not compromise the cost-containment

reforms that were passed last year. The rule passed last year limiting the restricted-earnings coach to \$4,000 in summer earnings has several harmful consequences. First, it is unfair to the coach who services the summer camps, because they are likely to have a value considerably higher than that. I asked all my faculty how they would react to a limit for the summer of \$4,000 from all academic classes. I think they would be unhappy and we can't expect our coaches to respond in any other way.

Secondly, the rule as now constituted is damaging to the camps, depriving them of the source of some of the best and most qualified teachers of the game. Thirdly, this rule will produce undesirable situations in which these coaches receive summer employment from local car dealerships and the like in order to supplement their salary to a level that permits them to remain in coaching. This proposed amendment would address each of these problems. It would allow coaches to be fairly compensated for summer services to camps. It would help preserve the quality and integrity of the camps, and it would prevent the need or at least lessen the pressure for outside jobs that potentially compromised institutional control.

It would do so without costing any budget an additional red cent. This proposal does not compromise cost control in the slightest and it does

not increase the number of coaches.

Curtis L. McCray (California State University, Long Beach): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge opposition to Proposal No. 50. The adoption of Proposal No. 50, similar to Proposal No. 49, would erode the intent of the legislation passed at last year's Convention. The establishment of restricted-earnings categories intended to encourage the development of new coaches while effectively limiting compensation to certain coaches. Limitation based on compensation earned during the summer was an attempt to discourage the practice of hiring more experienced coaches on a part-time or volunteer basis and supplementing such coaches with income in the summer camp earnings.

Such a practice does not encourage the development of new coaches and allows the institutions receiving major revenue from conducting summer camps to employ more experienced and arguably better coaches. Such proxy was contrary to the original intent of establishing coaching categories such as the volunteer and part-time coach. The establishment of a restricted-earnings category will serve to prevent any competitive coaching advantage that may result from the potential summer camp earnings and it will encourage more effectively the development of new coaches. On behalf of the Presidents Commission, Mr. Chair, I urge the defeat of Proposal No. 50.

[Proposal No. 50 (Page A-80) was defeated by Division I.]

Coaching Limitations—Ice Hockey

Donna E. Shalala (University of Wisconsin, Madison): On behalf of the Divisions I, II and III institutions that play Division I ice hockey, I move adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

Division	I	Business	Session	_
----------	---	----------	---------	---

It is our intent here not to increase the number of ice hockey coaches. but to recognize the need to ensure the safety and welfare of the student-athlete and to ensure productive practice/game environment. The sport of ice hockey needs three full-time experienced coaches. It is a high velocity contact sport and should have a player-coach ratio that does not exceed 12 to 1. This proposal will ensure that the athletes are properly coached and supervised during the course of the playing seasons and during the recruiting period. Therefore, on behalf of the institutions that play ice hockey in this country, I am pleased to move this proposal. I urge my colleagues to support it.

William E. Shelton (Eastern Michigan University): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 56. This proposal clearly goes against the reform package of last year by adding one assistant coach in the sport of ice hockey and eliminating, the restricted-earnings coach. This could increase costs to the institution, and I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 56.

Terrence J. Toy (University of Denver): Mr. Chair, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 56. I would like my colleagues and faculty. representatives to consider the academic impact of this legislation. Under the present situation, we have two coaches, a head coach who will now have additional responsibilities, and an assistant coach who also is the recruiter and will be on the road for most of the playing season. The coach who is most likely to be eliminated from our program will be the assistant coach who is most directly involved with the academic progress of our student-athletes, the assistant coach who monitors the class attendance, the assistant coach who operates the study halls, the assistant coach who reviews the course grades. I submit that this reduction of one coach is counter to the academic aspirations of this organization. The academic expectations provide one good reason for endorsing this proposition.

Secondly, under the present legislation, we will have, as I suggested, one coach and one assistant coach on the road for most of the season. I suggest that it is unrealistic to expect that one coach, even with the assistance of a restricted-earnings coach, to provide adequate supervision of practices and contacts in this high velocity contact sport.

Therefore, I submit that we should take the responsible position and support this proposal before the courts are asked to assess the adequacy of the supervision. Because of the potential for liability, I believe it is not a good place to save money. I would rather spend the money on coaches themselves than on the cost of an attorney. I think it is a very responsive move to do so. Mr. Schultz suggested that the rules may vary by sport, and I would simply endorse such legislation as this.

I believe I have given you two very good reasons to vote in favor of Proposal No. 56.

John A. DiBiaggio (Michigan State University): I believe in finetuning legislation that was passed just a year ago. On the other hand, we are aware that relatively few of the institutions represented at this particular meeting sponsor major hockey programs. Although for those

270

of us who do, we think it is an important sport with a very distinguished record of achievement in virtually every dimension. For instance, competitiveness. This is one of the few sports where various schools can compete with one another no matter what their size. The championship has been won, for instance, in the last several years by Michigan State and Minnesota and Wisconsin, but it has been won as well by Lake Superior State and St. Lawrence and Harvard.

, Secondly, there is great fan interest in hockey at our institutions. We have had over 110 straight sellouts in hockey at Michigan State University, for instance. The academic performance of the players in hockey is quite extraordinary. Each and every year, they have the highest academic average of any of the men's sports at our institution.

- Most of our schools, as you have learned, have fairly large squads, 30 or so, and they come from a broad geographical area, including Canada. As you might surmise, recruiting is challenging and very timeconsuming. Therefore, the attack taken a year ago to reduce to two the number of the full-time hockey coaches would result in a situation where one coach would be faced with the responsibility of managing those 30 students while the other was in the process of recruiting. That is virtually an untenable situation, I think you will all agree. Therefore, we would respectfully ask those schools without hockey programs to either join us in supporting this particular proposal or to abstain from voting, recognizing the uniqueness of those institutions most familiar with this particular situation.

[Proposal No. 56 (Page A-85) was defeated by Division I, 88-155.]

Coaching Limitations—Wrestling

: Michael L. Kasavana (Michigan State University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the 1991 Convention, the Division I membership established coaching limitations in all sports. In the sport of wrestling, effective August 1, 1992, institutions will be limited to one full-time head or assistant coach and one restricted-earnings coach. Such a limitation appears to group wrestling with several individual sports that do not share even the number of student-athletes or the physical elements of wrestling. Wrestling can be considered an individual sport and, therefore, similar to tennis, golf, rifle and fencing. But it has many of the ills of a team sport. Many are involved in competition at a given time. The number involved in practice sometimes reaches 50 to 60. The average number of student-athletes in wrestling is 24.4 students for each institution in Division I.

In recruiting, it is necessary to have one of the two coaches to be off campus, and it will be difficult for the remaining coach to safely manage the activities of all student-athletes. The allowance of an additional coach will reduce the risk of injury in practice facilities and allow more proper supervision in a tournament situation.

Although the adoption of this proposal results in an additional coach, it appears that such proposal is reasonable and could result in saving

ivision I Business Session	27	7

money by eliminating unnecessary injuries due to inadequate supervision. This proposal is recommended by the Subcommittee to Review 1991 Reform Proposals and is supported by the NCAA Council. I urge

you to adopt Proposal No. 57. Thank you.

Peter Likins (Lehigh University): There are a number of proposals before the house that roll back some of the reforms that were accomplished a year ago. We have all been conscious of the need to protect against those reverses. There is something here, though, in wrestling. Proposal No. 57, that sets it apart from all the others. That is why the Subcommittee to Review 1991 Reform Proposals made an exception here in support of this one. That is why the NCAA Council is in support of No. 57 and why the Presidents Commission has not expressed resistance to No. 57 that it has expressed to these many other efforts to roll back reform.

Yet, you wonder why. It seems to me that the clear differentiations here rises from the injury rate in the sport of wrestling. By all the statistics kept in the NCAA, this is the sport in which injuries are on a formalized basis most frequently. Moreover, this is a sport in which the injuries occur disproportionately in the practice room and not in competition. There is a very critical need, a safety need, to have supervision on the mat. I urge you to support No. 57.

[Proposal No. 57 (Page A-86) was approved by Division I.]

Additional Restricted-Earnings Coaches

Carl F. Ullrich (Patriot League): I move adoption of Proposal No. 58.

There are a number of delegates whose programs really not only sponsor but encourage maximum participation on the part of our student-athletes. This very often involves junior varsity teams. Some of our institutions have as many as 10, 12, 13 different sports for both men and women. In order to properly supervise safety and all the other things that go into such a program, we do need additional coaching support. We urge for those of us who do have such programs your support of No. 58.

Laing E. Kennedy (Cornell University): I urge the membership to support Proposal No. 58. As the former speaker illustrated, this is essential for member institutions that have a number of junior varsity programs other than football. These are legitimate organized intercollegiate programs that must meet at least one-half of the minimum contests required established by Bylaw 20.9.3.3. It is important for institutions to provide adequate teaching and safety and guidance for these important students who make up the junior varsity programs.

Frederick E. Gruninger (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): No. 58 addresses a special part of the intercollegiate program. For those of us who have subvarsity programs and have a lot of men and women involved in other team sports, we tried to look at this every way and we have addressed this before the Convention and the membership.

We do not want to discourage our men and women who want to come in at that subvarsity level to be a part of our programs. We have even

272 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

gone so far as to say that we have even looked at another way to address this problem of teaching and coaching the subvarsity with No. 59.

* '5', So, as a sponsor of No. 59, I just want to say to you that we looked at this way but we looked at the No. 58 way as the better way to deal with this problem. We do not want to discourage the men and women who want to be a part of our program by the fact we do not have the teaching staff to take care of their needs.

[Proposal No. 58 (Page A-87) was defeated by Division I.]

Coaching Limitations-Volunteer Coach

Craig Thompson (Sun Belt Conference): I move adoption of Proposal No. 60.

 \mathbb{N}_i · [The motion was seconded.]

Throposal No. 60 would redefine a volunteer coach and permit Division I institutions in sports other than football or basketball to utilize the services of one volunteer coach. At the 1991 Convention, the membership established coaching limits for the first time in Division I sports other than football or basketball. In response to the new limitations, many institutions expressed concern that a group of unpaid volunteers, such as former student-athletes and local club coaches, would not be allowed to coach and provide assistance to student-athletes.

This proposal would permit each sport, other than football and basketball, to utilize one volunteer coach who is restricted to campus activities and may not travel with the team. Thus, the adoption of this proposal would not result in any significant additional cost to the institution. This proposal is recommended by the subcommittee and is

supported by the Council.

Marcia L. Saneholtz (Washington State University): As president-elect of the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators and on behalf of that organization, I speak in support of Proposal No. 60. At a time when there is increasing concern about the declining number of women in the coaching profession, this legislation would permit our former student-athletes and other interested women to test the coaching waters and to help determine if this is a career path of interest to them. Secondly, in light of the attending staff reductions, this legislation allows improvement of the coach/student-athlete ratio in several sports with large numbers of participants, for example, track and field, thus enhancing the student-athlete experience. There is no cost attached to this legislation, and I urge your affirmative vote.

Carl F. Ullrich (Patriot League): Mr. Chair, this is not as adequate as No. 58 or No. 59, but this would speak to some of the concerns that those of us raised in discussing No. 58. We really strongly urge your support of this. We need it badly.

[Proposal No. 60 (Page A-88) was approved by Division I.]

Maximum Awards—Division I Equivalency Sports-Women

John A. DiBiaggio (Michigan State University): On behalf of the 11 members of the Big Ten Conference, I would like to move Proposal No. 62.

	7		
ivision I Business Session	۷,	Ι.	,

[The motion was seconded.]

In the interest of saving time and to avoid unnecessary repetition, I, would like to speak to No. 62 but at the same time I will be speaking, of course, to No. 63. Since the Council has forwarded a resolution to the Committee on Women's Athletics mandating a study on gender equity, it would seem prudent, and I think clearly responsible, that we delay the effective date of Proposal No. 40 passed just a year ago, which would reduce grants-in-aid to women in equivalency sports from August 1, 1993, to August 1, 1994, and women's basketball grants, which is Proposal No. 63, from August 1, 1992, to August 1, 1993.

Now, this action, of course, would not be without precedence since we have delayed consideration of normal-progress and admissions standards until this year when studies were completed on those two matters. Clearly, ladies and gentlemen, the equity issue is a very, very, s important one. It is one of great national interest, as well. One can stand here, I think, and argue that we should act on this matter because of Federal pressure and because of mandates. However, I believe there is a much more important reason to do so. Gender equity does not exist in intercollegiate athletics and we all know it. So, in order to rectify that situation, we should do the right thing and that is evaluate our circumstances and take the action necessary to begin to improve a serious inequity. There is something that I think everyone in this room agrees upon, even though we disagree on many other things, be we athletics directors or faculty representatives or chief executives. That is, we all have a common commitment and belief in fair play. In 3 that spirit. I urge you to support Proposal Nos. 62 and 63.

Chris Voelz (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I am president, of the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Directors and am speaking on behalf of women. We rise overwhelmingly in support of No. 62. As a part of the broad-brush approach of the reform, movement last year, No. 40 was swept in. Its passage decreased the net opportunities for women, and as President DiBiaggio says, exacerbated the dilemma, as we just saw, to gender equity for women in athletics. An affirmative vote on No. 62 will delay the implementation of No. 40 until the facts gleaned by that recent NCAA gender-equity study can be reviewed. Also, the information becomes evident with the passage of No. 40, such as the fact that men would have 45 to 53 percent more opportunities than women in Division I to have scholarships, the fact that the participants in individual sports would further be discriminated, and the interesting fact that at the majority of Division I schools, men's basketball and men's football scholarships would be greater in total than the entire women's program.

We ask both on behalf of the association, which is pleased to know that the Knight Commission, the NCAA Council and the Presidents Commission are all endorsing the passage of No. 62, that you endorse it as well.

R. Gerald Turner (University of Mississippi): We do, on behalf of the Presidents Commission, endorse Proposal No. 62 and Proposal No. [Proposal No. 62 (Page A-90) was approved by Division I.]

Maximum Awards—Division I Women's Basketball
John A. DiBiaggio (Michigan State University): Very quickly, Mr.
Chair, on behalf of the Big Ten Conference, I move Proposal No. 63.
[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 63 (Page A-91) was approved by Division I.]

Honorary Academic Awards

Joseph R. Geraud (University of Wyoming): I move adoption of Proposal No. 70.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 70 is intended to restore the concept of honorary academic awards, which are not to be included within the computation of permissible aid to a student-athlete. Some years ago, the Convention adopted the cost of education as a cap on permissible financial aid. At the time of that vote, there was considerable confusion as to what happened to historical exceptions to a full athletics grant. Gradually, over the years that confusion has been clarified. This Convention has removed Pell Grants up to \$1,700 from the limitations of the cost of feducation, GI Bill of Rights payments, payments incidental to participation in military reserve programs and ROTC, certain Federal centitlement programs and awards to disabled veterans by state forganizations.

However, the Council of the NCAA by interpretation has incorporated into our bylaws provisions that preclude excluding honorary awards from the cost of education. My concern arose because I had to tell a student-athlete that he was no longer eligible for competition. The reason was that he had graduated in four years and had been awarded a research grant, which exceeded the cost of education by \$4,000 to \$5,000. That is not permissible, so he could not stay if he accepted that research grant. I remind the Convention it was only about three or four years ago that we added research grants to the category of honorary awards.

I am troubled by the fact this body attempts to honor or foster the concept of the student-athlete and yet we will turn around and tell the individual who is very skilled and competent in both athletics and academics that he can only keep one award and not both. I have never received any real rationale from the Council as to the reasons for its interpretation. The best I have received is the usual concerns about somebody who will figure out how to make this a loophole. We will recreate false academic awards, on and on.

Now, I certify eligibility. I really think I trust my fellow faculty representatives to verify that these are truly honorary awards. I would remind the Convention that we have criteria set forth in our rules. To be an honorary academic award, it has to be an award of grant from a standing scholarship award for an established research grant published in the institution's catalog. The basis for the award or grant will be the candidate's academic award at the institution. The award or grant

shall be determined by competition among the student-athletes at a particular class and college of the institution. I simply firmly believe that if those criteria are met, this student-athlete ought to be able to obtain his honorary award and need not and should not be computed in the cost of education count.

R. Elaine Dreidame (University of Dayton): On behalf of the NCAA. Council and the NCAA Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I urge your opposition to Proposal No. 70. It is obvious that the effect of this proposal would be to eliminate the cost of attendance limitation for honorary academic awards and research grants established on the provisions of NCAA Bylaw 15.02.5. While the Council expressed some concern about the potential abuse that could result from the adoption of this legislation, the opposition stems primarily from its effect on other potential recipients of aid. Specifically, the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism takes this position since this proposal may result in some student-athletes receiving funds in excess of their educational expenses.

The proposal may hinder the institution's ability to award additional scholarship funds to other students whose educational expenses are not met. This apparent inequity is inconsistent with generally accepted principles of institutional financial aid and represents an erosion of one of the basic tenets on which the NCAA is financially based, that it should not exceed the student-athlete's cost of attendance. On behalf of the Council and the amateurism committee, I urge your opposition to Proposal No. 70.

[Proposal No. 70 (Page A-98) was defeated by Division I, 131-162]

Equivalency Computations

Joseph C. Lang (Georgetown University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 71.

[The motion was seconded.]

I also would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 71-1 at this time.

[The motion was seconded.]

Amendment-to-amendment No. 71-1 was submitted to clear up the confusion created by the wording of Proposal No. 71 and will, in fact, replace No. 71. The intent of Proposal No. 71-1 is to lengthen the way in which financial aid is counted for equivalencies in Bylaw 15 and for Division I minimum criteria in Bylaw 20. I ask the delegates to support the adoption of Proposal No. 71-1.

Susan A. Collins (George Mason University): On behalf of the Council, I rise to speak in opposition to No. 71-1. Proposal Nos. 71-1 and 72 all have the same primary question at issue: What types of financial aid should be included in figuring two different limits? One, the maximum team equivalencies in Bylaw 15.5 and the minimum financial aid commitment necessary to maintain Division I membership per Bylaw 20.9.1. For each limit, equivalencies in membership, the Convention will decide whether it wishes to use, and I recognize that this is roughly stated, the relatively narrow category of so-called pure

athletics aid. That is athletics scholarships or procedure categories of accountable aid that would include other types of institutional financial assistance. Whatever your preference regarding these limits and the types of aids that should be included in each, the Council recognizes its responsibility first and foremost to clarify the result of any particular proposal's adoption; and to that end, the Council has prepared a simple chart intended to illustrate which types of financial aid, so-called pure athletics aid for the more broadly defined aid, would be included in each climit depending on which proposal is adopted.

That chart was circulated in conference meetings after the Council pre-Convention meeting earlier this week. Copies are also available for the delegates at this business session. You will note that definitions of athletics and Council aid have been listed at the top of each page to help clarify these proposals. Please do not misunderstand. The Council has a strong preference in relation to these proposals. It firmly believes that team equivalencies for purposes of Bylaw 15.5 should continue to be calculated using total countable aid just as those limits are currently calculated and that financial aid minimums for purposes of membership criteria should be based on a more narrow definition of athletics aid as originally intended by the Special Committee to Review the NCAA Membership Structure.

The special committee developed its minimum with a clear understanding that those minimums would be based on the institution's commitments to funding true athletics grants. I urge you, on the Council's behalf, to restore that intended balance. Similarly, the team equivalency limits traditionally have been determined in relation to the countable financial aid. I urge you to inspect the balance that has been established carefully over many years by defeating Proposal No. 71-1 and supporting No. 72.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): Earlier this morning, we discussed within the aegis of Division I-AA Nos. 71 and 71-1 at some length and found there were some idiosyncracies that were associated with both that posed complications. Let me see if I can't list those idiosyncracies now. No. 71-1 is absolutely critical and we urge its passing for two simple reasons. Number one, the body recalls that a year ago we voted "yes" on a proposal that identified certain physical thresholds that had to be met by Division I teams within these universities in order to maintain Division I status. One of them, for example, identified a quarter million dollars for the support of a number of athletics programs as a prelude to the conclusion of "yes" with regard to eligibility, with regard to participation. It so happens in counting the dollars associated with those thresholds, in order to meet them, a number of us made the decision to include legally some institutions' specific financial aid.

Now, the purpose of No. 71-1 is to ensure that that earlier neatly construed issue is not abrogated, denigrated or compromised with regard to what we did last year. That is why I went through the history. Therefore, back to No. 71-1, the key issue is Part B-(a). Countable

financial aid, our interpretation from this morning's discussion is that countable financial aid is inclusive of the institution's specific aid. Once, we accept that as a truism, then I don't think we have any choice but to accept again the validity of saying "yes" on No. 71-1.

That, then, in effect amends No. 71 so that No. 71-B-(a) becomes not; just simply athletics financial aid but "countable financial aid" as amended in No. 71-1. Therefore, on that basis, I am strongly urging, that we adopt No. 71-1 because of the historical significance of No. 71-1. Part B-(a).

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University). Everyone is tired and I recognize this is the worst time of the day to be considering legislation like this, but it is important legislation. I have seen all the straw votes and I am a little afraid that many of you have-already decided on how you will vote on this legislation. I am compelled to tell you that it is dangerous legislation for many of your programs. More has been written about it and we have had more handouts about Proposals 71 and 72 than any other legislation at this Convention.

Yet, I feel confident to say that more confusion remains about them than any other proposals. Proposal No. 71-1 does not simply undo Proposal No. 71. A single word and a single reference number in the current legislation is being altered. Proposal 71-1 is written to link. Bylaw 15 and Bylaw 20, and being proposed as fair play and protection legislation against Proposal 72. It is, however, not as simple as that. These proposals are not amending regulations, clarifying rules or closing loopholes. This legislation is now tinkering with the definitions of countable aid and equivalency calculations, which, fellow delegates, are the very fabric of all of our financial aid regulations and the desires for a level playing field.

The implications are much farther reaching than they appear. I expect we will continue to hear eloquent debate about these proposals. My point, however, is quite simple. This is confusing legislation. Do you really understand it? Have you analyzed the impact it will have on your programs? The current legislation is fair and equitable. The proposed amendment is damaging. This is not neutral legislation, even if Proposal 72 fails. Reconsider your vote even if your book is marked and you thought your mind was made up. Now is not the time, and these are not the proposals to amend our rules. Please, we must defeat this amendment and, more importantly, vote for both Proposals 71 and 72. Thank you.

Peter Likins (Lehigh University): I rise in support of No. 71-1. I congratulate the Council in providing us with this summary document. I think it is very, very helpful. As I read it, and I hope that all of you will look at it carefully, I come first to the conclusion that simply because this is such complex territory we should use consistently one definition for all of our judgments and constraints in the NCAA and we can see that as the legislation currently stands it is countable aid that counts in both categories, and that is fine with me.

No. 71-1 restores that symmetry. I will support it for that reason, but

Twould urge that everyone in the room look at this sheet and behave in such a way as to preserve the symmetry so both categories, both sets of definitions employ the countable version, and then work your way through the complexities of the debate seeking that objective. I will vote "yes" on No. 71-1, but what I really want is to preserve countable aid in both categories.

Joseph C. Lang (Georgetown University): Mr. Chair, I just want to second the remarks of the previous speaker. What happened last year in Proposition 46, and its amendments, is that we ended up with institutional aid being counted both for equivalencies and division membership requirements. It was the intent of No. 71-1 to ensure that we would continue to count the same way, both below the line. What was counted was not a concern in our proposal. The only thing that was a concern is that we have one method of counting.

Mr. Fort: I think that Dr. Likins' comments just a minute ago from Lehigh University pretty well eliminate some of the confusion related to the problems associated with No. 71 or No. 71-1. He speaks of symmetry, and I agree with Peter in that regard. Again, the speaker that just spoke makes a direct reference to the importance of the relationship between No. 71-1 and our passage of legislation last year in terms of what we could count institutionally as far as the institution's fiscal aid is concerned so as to meet the required physical threshold to enable us to get in the haven of safety with respect to Division I status.

I again, in summary, state that No. 71 alone is no good. In fact, I am opposed to No. 71 as it currently stands, because it is too restrictive relative to the phraseology contained in No. 71-B-(a), the line that says "athletics financial aid." The only way, therefore, that we can abrogate the insidiousness associated with No. 71, period, is to adopt No. 71-1. I am urging strongly that position.

[Proposal No. 71-1 (Page A-100) was approved by Division I, 186-130]

[Proposal No. 71 (Page A-99) was defeated by Division I, as amended by No. 71-1.]

Membership Requirements—Division I Financial Aid

Frank Windegger (Texas Christian University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 72.

[The motion was seconded.]

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): I would like to move the adoption of Amendment-to-amendment No. 72-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to give some procedural history to this amendment. As many may recall, last year the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference sponsored Proposal No. 46-3 that said countable aid is a formula for use within the minimum requirements for NCAA Division I members. As a result of that success, the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference heard from many constituencies that this was unfair in that formula. Primarily, the fact that work study and other employment types of financial aid or countable aid were used to meet NCAA minimum

		270
Division I Busine.	ss Session	 4 I S

requirements that entailed student-athletes earning those funds. As a result of that, the Metro Atlantic Conference proposed in July Proposal No. 73. Subsequently, Proposal 72 was sponsored by the NCAA Council. At that point, we put in the current Proposal 72-1, which in effect will take the language from No. 73 and transpose it to Proposal No. 72. We ask for your support for this proposal.

Mr. Windegger: The Council strongly opposes this amendment. It is not an attempt to fine-tune or introduce some slight modification of Proposal No. 72; it is an attempt to gut the proposal. A vote for Proposal No. 72-1 is a vote against Proposal 72 as sponsored by the Council. The minimum financial aid requirements adopted last year as proposed in No. 46 were intended by the Special Committee to Review the NCAA Membership Structure to require Division I institutions to demonstrate a reasonable commitment to a broad-based athletics program.

Throughout the development of these standards, the special committee was clear that it would be based on athletics aid as it is defined in a narrow sense. As you know, Proposal No. 46 was amended last year in a very close vote to permit institutions to use any countable financial aid awarded by the member institution to meet the appropriate aminimum requirement. This action to amend Proposal No. 46 was entirely inconsistent with the special committee's intent in developing these criteria and will result in a serious dilution of financial aid minimums proposed by the special committee unless the legislation adopted last year is modified consistent with the special committee's original recommendations. The Council's Proposal No. 72 will cease just such a modification and the provisions of Proposal No. 72-1'are designed to render the proposal meaningless. On the Council's behalf, I strongly urge your opposition to Proposal No. 72-1.

Samuel H. Magill [Monmouth College (New Jersey)]: Last year, this Convention voted, although narrowly, to repudiate the recommendation of the Committee on Restructuring. I believe that the Convention at this point felt it was inappropriate and not timely. I think it would be a serious mistake to vote now to adopt that original proposal. I would suggest very strongly that at this time in the history of higher seducation and of athletics, where we are all struggling to keep our heads above water—and many public institutions having taken severe financial blows, private institutions similarly—to make a move now to return to a more expensive requirement would be really, really, inappropriate.

I urge the support of No. 72-1, which would include the provision for countable financial aid for meeting the membership requirements.

Brother Thomas J. Scanlan (Manhattan College): I speak in favor of No. 72-1. It carries the same emphasis as the recently passed No. 71-1 in terms of maintaining countable financial aid for both minimum and maximum. It does very strongly and clearly, as stated by the Council representative, work against No. 72. This reversal of last years. Convention vote, on No. 46-3, I think is unacceptable action from any source. It is an extraordinary action from the Council itself. In addition.

many institutions choose to target their aid to highly academically qualified student-athletes, some of it academically to the students and some of it academically to the athlete part of the student-athlete with the desire to reward and to emphasize the student over the athlete among such individuals.

If No. 72 is passed, such institutions would be compelled to simply repackage all aid to student-athletes and offer it only as athletics aid. Thus, the proponents of No. 72 would ultimately only have a pirate victory but one that would run contrary to the message of academic reform led by the Presidents Commission. In addition, it is an infringement on institutional autonomy as to how best to package its institutional dollars to its student-athletes.

William H. Harris (Texas Southern University): Mr. Chair, I can hardly expand upon the eloquence of the previous speaker, but I would add one thing more just for clarification. Passage of No. 72, without No. 72-1, would lead us all into a quagmire of making sure that we package our money right.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): Mr. Chair, Lean't supersede the eloquence of my colleague from Texas Southern University. I would like to suggest this in agreement with what he has said, as well as the previous speaker before him; if you look again carefully at No. 72-1, you have three peculiarities which we can subcategorize as thus:

Number one, the Council is dead wrong in relationship to its attempt to get us to buy in to Proposal No. 72 and, therefore, turn back the clock and reverse the action we took last year as pertains to what we can count as that which is fiscally sound and appropriate and legal in relationship to the thresholds we must meet in order to get the \$250,000 to become Division I players.

Fact number two is, of course, the reality that No. 72-1 does precisely to Proposal 72 what we have already said "yes" to in relationship to what No. 71-1 did to Proposal 71.

Then, point three, of course, is the fact that it would be unconscionable for us to attempt to water down the right and the prerogative of the individual institutions as pertains to what they define as "countable field." The only way we can preserve the promulgation of the countable and concept is to vote "yes" on No. 72-1.

Trank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): Mr. Chair, Proposal No. 71 has been defeated and it remains even more important that Proposal No. 72 is also defeated. The decisions about amendment No. 72-1 have been made, I feel, for the wrong reasons. A common theme in the discussion about this amendment is that it is damage-control legislation against the passage of Proposal No. 72. No. 72-1 certainly seems better than No. 72, because it eliminates counting athletics aid for minimum membership requirements. No. 72-1 has also been presented as compromised legislation. There is a comment, but the counting of Federal work-study dollars is being given up since loans don't count already. Unfortunately,

it is substantially more than that.

The language of the proposal will also eliminate the counting of all other on-campus student employment, some off-campus employment at at letics interests intercede and outside grants based on at letics criteria. The question to you again is very simple. How many scholar ships equivalencies will you lose, not counting these resources? Have you analyzed the impact that this will have on your program? The arguments that have been put forth that these proposals will accelerate gender equity or reduce the belief that many schools are running. Division I programs off the back of our poor students are not valid. They confuse the issues, and this is not the legislation that should deal with these valid questions.

Pure and simple, our own definitions are being changed. This is damaging legislation to the entirety of your programs and will be a disaster for at least moderate-budgeted programs. Don't think otherwise. While principally you should be opposed to No. 72-1, vote "yes" if you must, but please, I urge you then to vote "no" for No. 72. Thank you very much.

Carl F. Ullrich (Patriot League): We try to always support the proposals that have been presented by the Council. It really troubles me that they do not seem to recognize what I believe and what we believe is the real measure of an institution's commitment to intercollegiate athletics—the institutional countable aid that it awards its student-athletes. Please don't pass anything in this minimum boggling, series of legislation in Nos. 71, 72 and 73 that doesn't recognize that. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 72-1 (Page A-102) was approved by Division I, 168-

[Proposal No. 72 (Page A-101) was defeated by Division I, as amended by No. 72-1.]

[NOTE: The Division I business session was recessed at 5 p.m.]

Thursday Morning, January 9, 1992

The Division I business session was called to order at 8 a.m., with Division I Vice-President Douglas S. Hobbs, University of California; Los Angeles, presiding.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Financial Aid Limitations—Men's Ice Hockey

Stuart P. Haskell (North Atlantic Conference): I move Proposal No. 74 for the delegates' consideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 74 is existing legislation that was passed by pretty good margins at past Conventions and it pertains to clearly defining and clearly limiting the amounts of scholarship aid that could be offered in the sports of football and basketball. The sponsors of this proposal are asking the delegates to permit the sport of ice hockey to be included in this type of legislation. As I said, this legislation is already on the books

32 _______1992 Convention Proceedings

and No. 74 will simply be adding two words—ice hockey—to existing legislation pertaining to scholarship allocations, which exists now in football and basketball. It appears to be complicated but it is simply adding one more sport for the legislation. We ask the delegates for their support.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): As the speaker mentioned yesterday, this is a proposal that applies to a sport that a relatively few Division I institutions play, but a sport which is dear to the hearts of those of us who do play it. This proposal would require that in ice hockey as in football and basketball, there be mandatory financial aid counting of all students who are on financial aid, including those on need-based aid. A substantial number of Division I schools, including the majority of the ECAC schools, play need-based hockey. With due respect to the previous speaker, it is not really existing legislation; it would take a sport, ice hockey, and add it to the minority of two sports, which the Manual treats very, very differently in financial aid terms. The real issue is whether the number of individual counters on financial aid, whether athletics aid or need-based aid, is enough in this legislation.

There are many of us who give need-based and athletics-based aid in the sport of Division I ice hockey, who believe the number of people in this legislation is too small and that we may have young men who are hold they simply cannot skate on the ice in a varsity game because they have ice hockey. I would urge the delegates to consider this very carefully. It is not simply current legislation. It would treat ice hockey differently in the way we now treat only two other of the 25 or 30 NCAA championship sports. I would urge you to vote against it.

William J. Cleary Jr. (Harvard University): While I feel the spirit and intent of this proposal may be good, I take exception with the number 25 as the limit on the total number of counters. We have polled our schools in the ECAC and feel that the number is too low and deprived many students from competing on a varsity squad. We don't rely heavily on athletics aid, and having coached hockey for 22 years I simply would not tell a student that they can't play because they have need-based financial aid. This is not fair and it is a lawsuit waiting to happen. Also, we are discouraging schools from having junior varsity programs. It will allow a lot of students a chance to compete on a varsity at some time during their collegiate careers. In essence, we are telling students that they cannot play because they are on financial aid. This is wrong and defeats the purpose of why we are in business. Therefore, I urge you to vote against this proposal.

Michael A. Ploszek (University of Maine): I speak in support of Proposal No. 74. It is important legislation that provides a critical path to parity and accountability within the sport of ice hockey. It provides for fair and equitable treatment of all schools in regard to responsible use of financial aid within reasonable, fixed-number participation limits. In addition, it provides a critical opportunity to close the multisport loophole in counting ice hockey financial aid. I urge your support

of this proposal, and I urge the nonhockey playing schools to abstain. [Proposal No. 74 (Page A-103) was defeated by Division I, 70-71.]

Financial Management

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 75.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this legislation is to permit student-athletes on Pell Grants to receive management from the institution for their Pell Grant funds. If this seems like a familiar piece of legislation, it should be toyou, because it was on the agenda last year and failed by a narrow, margin. The faculty representatives of the College Football Association asked that it be given another shot because we do think it is good legislation and would help solve a problem with student-athletes, which is real. Current legislation permits personal services to studentathletes beyond what nonathlete students get in only one area, and that is academic services.

The tutoring and special assistance, which is justified because of the special pressures that we perceive student-athletes to be under with their high demands for both academics and athletic activities, is permitted. The young people who receive Pell Grants are people who, are from poor economic circumstances and have not had an opportunity to carefully manage funds. They receive the Pell Grants once each year. The opportunity to spend that money is present. The need perhaps to send it home is sometimes overpowering. The money may not be available to them when they need it for transportation or for personal needs.

So, this is permissive to permit the institution to provide management for those funds with the permission of the student-athlete, a benefit not available to regular students but justified because of the peculiar circumstances of lack of experience.

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): I rise on behalf of the Pacific-10 institutions to oppose No. 75. We can see no reason for making an exception to the normal in allowing the university to manage the Pell Grant funds that are given to students when it does not manage the funds that are given to students generally, including the other funds that are given to student-athletes.

Robert M. Sweazy (Texas Tech University): There are many horror stories associated with athletes mismanaging their Pell Grant money. I will not take the time at this moment to elaborate. It is sufficive to say in this economic environment, even Alan Greenspan has trouble managing his personal resources. This legislation is needed. It is good legislation, and there is no down side to it. It is permissive. If the student-athlete doesn't wish the service, he or she doesn't have to take it. If the institution doesn't wish to provide this service, they don't have to. Unlike so much other permissive legislation, it will not create an unlevel playing field. I only wish this NCAA legislation were applicable to all Pell Grant recipients at our institutions, because they all need this help. We should not deny it to our student-athletes.

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): This proposal is an exact repeat of Proposal No. 86, which was defeated last year, and for all the same reasons should be defeated again this year. I am opposed to it. Despite the rationale, I have difficulty in understanding the purpose, more importantly, the need for this proposal. Rather than being permissive legislation, this is over-legislation. Current options and opportunities already exist for the management of the Pell ³¹Grant and other financial aid funds by institutional personnel.

This proposed exception to the extra-benefit rule is simply unnecessary. This proposal seeks to create a formal campus student bank contrary to the rationale; and speaking for the university fiscal officers. this would result in more than minimal cost to the institution. While it Seems benign, this proposal provides nothing but headaches and more expenses for the majority of the institutions. I encourage you to oppose

[Proposal No. 75 (Page A-105) was defeated by Division I.]

Contest Exemptions—Division | Basketball

David B. Keilitz (Central Michigan University): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 76.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 76 will permit Division I member institutions to exempt annually a home exhibition contest against a foreign team and home exhibition contest against the USA Basketball club team from its maximum number of basketball contests. Neither of these games requires any additional costs and does not result in lost class time. Both games also produce much needed revenues for the institution. The Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council support this proposal. [Proposal No. 76 (Page A-106) was approved by Division I.]

Contest Exemptions—Division I Basketball

David L. Outcalt (University of Wisconsin, Green Bay): I move approval of Proposal No. 81.

The motion was seconded.

You have before you the rationale for Proposal 81 in the Official Notice. I wish to emphasize these points. The Great Alaska Shootout provides an outstanding competitive experience for student-athletes from seven Division I institutions, in addition to the host university of Alaska Anchorage. The student-athletes also are provided with an educational experience observing a physical and cultural setting quite unlike that to be found elsewhere. Holding the tournament over the Thanksgiving holidays minimized missed class time. I urge you to join me in voting to assure the continuation of this fine and unusual tournament.

Joseph N. Crowley (University of Nevada): As a member of the NCAA Council, I rise to speak on behalf of the Council in favor of Proposal No. 81, which the Council supports because it does not believe that participation in the Great Alaska Shootout, which takes place during the Thanksgiving holiday weekend, will adversely affect the limitations placed on the time demands of student-athletes that were

1992 Convention	Proceedings	. 1		1	
-----------------	-------------	-----	--	---	--

adopted at the last Convention.

[Proposal No. 81 (Page A-111) was approved by Division I.]

Resolution: Division I Basketball Playing Season

James Haney (Big West Conference): I move adoption of Resolution No. 82 on behalf of the listed sponsors.

[The motion was seconded.]

Beginning with the 1992-93 academic year, December 1 will be the first date a contest can be played in the sport of basketball. Many institutions do not permit their athletics teams to play during finals week in December. In addition, some institutions restrict the scheduling of contests during dead week or the week prior to finals week. The combination of a shortened season and a reduced number of available December playing dates caused by these institutional academic restrictions force scheduling of additional weekday contests with their associated missed class time. This resolution asks the NCAA Council to sponsor legislation at the 1993 NCAA Convention that will permit." Division I institutions to play games over the Thanksgiving holiday when no classes will be missed.

[Proposal No. 82 (Page A-112) was approved by Division I.]

Divisions I and II Playing and Practice Seasons—Individual Sports

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 88.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 88 would permit member institutions' coaches in individual sports to participate in individual workouts with the student-athletes from the coaches' team during the summer only, provided their request for such assistance is initiated by the student. athlete. At the 1991 Convention, legislation was adopted to restrict. practice activities during the summer in individual sports. Under the definition of "practice," a coach would be precluded from providing individual assistance or conducting a workout with the studentathletes even on an informal basis. For example, a student-athlete could not play a round of ball or a tennis match with his or her coach?

This proposal would permit individual interaction between a coach and a student-athlete at the student-athlete's request during the summer as opposed to the academic year, without compromising the principle underlying the prohibition against out-of-season practice. It should be noted that an official interpretation related to this proposal would permit a coach to be involved with more than one student-athlete; at a time, provided the request is initiated by each student-athlete. This proposal is recommended by the fine tuning committee and: supported by the Council.

Elizabeth L. Fahey (Pennsylvania State University): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 88. Although we understand that in some respects it runs counter to the reform movement, this proposal recognizes the need for and allows for $\frac{V_{i}}{V_{i}}$ flexibility to better serve the needs and demands that exist for

individual sports participation. There are individual-sport athletes who require this extra help to establish the best performance. This proposal maintains that this cannot be a required or financially supported factor by the member institution. Therefore, it is not talking about mandatory practice, but rather practices explicitly caused solely by the student-athlete. We don't feel this goes against the reform movement but fine-tunes across the board legislation. We urge your support of Proposal No. 88.

[Proposal No. 88 (Page A-118) was approved by Division I.]

Maximum Dates of Competition—Fencing

Merry L. Ormsby (Columbia University-Barnard College): I move adoption of Proposal No. 91.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal seeks the same exemption for fencing now available for tennis, recognizing the individual nature of fencing. We urge your support in providing consistent opportunities among individual sports.

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 91. During the 1991 Convention, the NCAA membership voted to reduce the maximum number of contests and dates of competition in all sports in an effort to reduce athletics department costs and pressure upon students. The adoption of Proposal No. 91 could increase the number of fencing competitions in which an institution may participate and thus would erode the intent of the legislation adopted at last year's Convention.

[Proposal No. 91 (Page A-120) was defeated by Division I.]

Maximum Contests Limitations-Field Hockey

Stuart P. Haskell Jr. (North Atlantic Conference): Mr. Chair, as commissioner of the North Atlantic Conference, I move Proposal No.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is offered by institutions that sponsor the sport of field hockey. The reason we have this legislation before us is that legislation enacted at recent NCAA Conventions did not provide the sport of field hockey with competitive opportunities in the so-called nontraditional segments, although those opportunities were provided for most other sports. These institutions, therefore, are asking and requesting passage, that this wonderful sport be treated equally with men's and women's soccer programs, which are also conducted at the same time of the year and have those opportunities. I describe this as corrective legislation, which is entirely fair and reasonable for this sport. Again, the institutions that support this sport, and certainly the young women who participate, respectfully ask for the delegates' support. Thank you very much.

Charles E. Young (University of California, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I rise in opposition to Proposal No. 92 for the same reasons that I gave for opposition to Proposal No. 91.

Christine H. B. Grant (University of Iowa): I would encourage

			n 11
	1000	Convention	Proceedii
	1447	$\mathbf{L}.omvenuon$	1 LOCECON.

support for this particular proposal. As the previous speaker mentioned, this legislation simply brings field hockey into line with other sports. with a nontraditional season, and especially equalizes field hockey with the sister sport of ice hockey. This is really a fairness issue in field hockey.

Kristin L. Burns (Northeastern University): The effect of Proposal 92 is to create a nontraditional segment for field hockey, bringing it in line with other team sports. Cost effects are minimized by changing. from date of competition, whereby several contests may be played on a particular day, to a limit of 20 contests total during the traditional season.

Eleanor R. Lemaire (University of Rhode Island): While we support the Presidents Commission's wisdom in this, we think it was & an oversight that jeopardizes the schools that wish to priortize the sport of field hockey. It does not increase playing season, it does not increase playing dates, it provides for competition in the nontraditional season. We hope you support this.

Judith A. Davidson (Central Connecticut State University): I am from Central Connecticut State University and president of the United States Field Hockey Association Central Connecticut State University does not have field hockey. We are supportive of this legislation; and while I would like to echo everything that has been said in support of it; I would like to point out that Division II and Division III overwhelmingly passed the legislation. We would appreciate your support.

[Proposal No. 92 (Page A-121) was approved by Division I.]

First Contest Date—Divisions I and II Soccer

Laurence C. Keating Jr. (Seton Hall University): I move Proposal No. 93.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would ask that one of the sponsors of the amendment might want to move the amendment first. If not, I will move the Amendment-toamendment No. 93-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 93-1 is an adjustment in the first contest date for Divisions I and II soccer. It is very much akin to what we have just passed in the proposition to look at the basketball starting date moving back one weekend to enable us to play a schedule in a more comparable way. Soccer is allowed to play 20 games currently; and given the schedule with the September 7 starting date, it is virtually impossible to play more than 16 of these games without playing more than two within a given week. We think a trade-off of a couple of more days of practice, counting back from the starting date, is a small price to pay for the academic and athletics soundness of playing no more than two games a week. So we would ask your support for No. 93-1.

Johnson D. Bowie (Drexel University): I would like to echo the aspects of the corresponding date of September 7 to be now the first weekend in September. Secondly, the other side I see in this is hopefully our colleagues in field hockey and men's and women's cross country

______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

would join in so we have a precedent for every year.

Carl F. Ullrich (Patriot League): In presenting this amendment, it just seemed like the first weekend in September was a reasonable compromise between that 7 September date that is now in the rule book and No. 93. We urge your support, and we particularly need it in the Northeast where weather becomes a factor at the end of the fall season.

Ronald G. Eaglin (Coastal Carolina College of the University of South Carolina): I am here on behalf of the Presidents Commission and I urge you to oppose No. 93 and its amendment. During the 1991 Convention, in an effort to assist institution's athletics departments in reducing costs, the membership enacted legislation to preclude an institution from beginning competition in the sport of soccer until September 7. The legislation, in conjunction with legislation related to preseason practice opportunities, would result in many institutions saving cost necessary in housing and feeding student-athletes who must return to campuses prior to the beginning of the institution's academic year. Legislation to permit institutions to begin competition on September 1 or the preceding Friday, if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday, would result in institutions being able to bring student-athletes back for soccer practice in some institutions at a date earlier than the old legislation, which was August 15. Thus, this legislation clearly is contrary to the reform idea of cost-containment. and I urge you to vote against Proposal No. 93 or its amendment.

[Proposal No. 93-1 (Page A-123) was adopted by Division I.]

Laurence C. Keating Jr. (Seton Hall University): With respect to the Council's concern about the cost-containment, next year happens to be one of those years where it is least effective. It is permissive legislation and doesn't require practice to move back on something prior to August 15. I think the efforts by cross country and field hockey will come back next year and bring this in line and might even be dealt with with the shortening of practice seasons so that we do not go against the wishes of the Council on cost containment and still are able to conduct our seasons in the proper way.

[Proposal No. 93 (Page A-122) was approved by Division I, as amended by No. 93-1.]

Preseason Soccer Scrimmages

Laurence C. Keating Jr. (Seton Hall University): I move Proposal

[The motion was seconded.]

I believe this was an oversight when we passed the legislation last year, and indication is that the Council does support the use of some of these playing dates as scrimmage dates prior to the start of the playing

Johnson D. Bowie (Drexel University): To pick up on that, there will be no additional cost; and if anything, there might be less cost because scrimmages cost less. Secondly, on top of that, it does not come out of the total number of games. As the Council and the Presidents Commission recall, this would not be anything permissive in that

# 1	Division I	Business	Session	
-----	------------	----------	---------	--

aspect.

Mr. Keating: The other issue, I think, is that it allows us to use some of our appointed dates in scrimmage opportunities rather than in some ways forcing coaches to use the appointed dates, again causing them to be play three and sometimes four days a week during the practices.

Carl F. Ullrich (Patriot League): It really saves us from putting 10 pounds in a five-pound bag. There is no additional cost, there is no additional contest. Everything counts. It is just a question of being able to spread it out in a more reasonable way.

[Proposal No. 94 (Page A-123) was approved by Division I.]

Athletics Housing

David B. Keilitz (Central Michigan University): On behalf of the ¹²-Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 120.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the 1991 Convention, the membership adopted legislation that precluded Division I member institutions from housing studentathletes in athletics dorms or athletics blocks within dorms. Proposal No. 120 is consistent with the objectives of that legislation in that it would prevent institutions from placing student-athletes in privately owned dorms or apartment buildings in which at least 50 percent of the residents are student-athletes. As with the 1991 legislation, a four-year phase-in period is permitted.

[Proposal No. 120 (Page A-149) was approved by Division I.]

Outside Competition

Carlo Tramontozzi [St. Francis Čollege (New York)]: I move the adoption of Proposal No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of the legislation is to permit student-athletes from institutions that do not sponsor nontraditional segments in their sport to compete in noncollegiate outside competition during their academic year. The reason for NCAA legislation forbidding student-athletes from competing in outside teams in the academic year is counterproductive in those institutions that don't sponsor nontraditional seasons. The intent of the legislation is to reduce the time commitment of student-athletes.

The time demands will actually be increased when the institutions conduct nontraditional seasons in order to provide competition opportunities that student-athletes previously provided for themselves, an institution that previously did not conduct a nontraditional season with additional staffing, facility and transportation costs.

That is the rationale offered by the sponsoring institutions. I would like to add something and to educate this body as to what outside soccer competition means. It is not merely a team; it is a club. It is the very center of the student's life. In many big cities, like New York, these clubs are an acclamation. That is where these students grow up, where their parents, friends and relatives belong. And this is where the parents protect the students from a drug-infested society. So, to take these athletes away from soccer eight months of the year, and in

Addition to that to take them away from their community and from their family where playing soccer for them has a very emotional meaning (would be harmful).

Student-athletes feel very important in their community. For those institutions, like St. Francis College, which do not sponsor soccer, this is a very good compromise. For those students who have to make a very difficult choice, whether to play for the college or the club, in many cases it means that they will be dropping out of college, which is contrary to what Proposal 93 was supposed to do. I urge this membership, for those students, for those colleges that have the burden of individual costs to vote for this proposal.

Susan A. Collins (George Mason University): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I urge defeat of Proposal No. 46, which was defeated in Division II yesterday. Proposal No. 46 erodes the legislation that was adopted last year by allowing student-athletes at those institutions that do not sponsor nontraditional seasons in their sports to participate on outside teams during the academic year outside the season. Last year's legislation, which does not allow student-athletes to compete in outside teams during the academic year, even outside the season, was an attempt to alleviate the time demands that are placed on the student-athletes to compete on outside teams during the academic year and attempt to give more student-athletes more time to spend on their academic work. Let's not take a step backwards by adopting this legislation.

[Proposal No. 46 (Page A-75) was defeated by Division I.]

Recruiting Calendars—Division I Sports Other Than Football and Basketball

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): On behalf of the NCAA "Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 3:125.

[The motion was seconded.]

During last year's Convention, the Division I membership overwhelmingly adopted a resolution that the NCAA Council work in conjunction with the appropriate coaches association in each sport to develop recommendations to reduce the time period when authorized Division I institutional athletics department staff members may recruit prospective student-athletes off campus to approximately three months. The Recruiting Committee surveyed each Division I sport's coaches association for input concerning the best procedure to establish the recruiting calendar. Proposal No. 125 establishes a 93-day floating recruiting calendar for each sport, other than football and basketball, and provides maximum flexibility for recruiting in each of these sports. Restricting the time periods during which an institution may contact and evaluate prospective student-athletes at all institution campuses is believed to be an effective method of reducing institutional spending by limiting the amount of time and travel incurred in off-campus recruiting activities.

Also, the adoption of this proposal will provide more opportunities for

290 .		1007	Convention	n Proceedin
270 .	 (776	COULCIBIO	n i rocccum

athletics department staff members to remain on campus during key:

periods of the academic year, further, requiring each sport to designate
in writing the date it will utilize for recruiting during a calendar year;

prior to the first day of recruiting in that sport as a safeguard that
provides administrative ease for athletics administrators and coaches.

The NCAA Council and the Recruiting Committee urge your support of
the adoption of Proposal No. 125.

John J. Coyle (Pennsylvania State University): While I admire the efforts of the Recruiting Committee to get a handle on this particular piece of legislation, effort after effort has failed to come up with the right solution. I urge defeat of this. I think that none of us can afford 93 days on the road in any particular sport, and it is very confusing to administer. Lastly, it will be very confusing to prospects because no two coaches or schools will pick the same dates. I think it was a good effort but I urge its defeat.

Marcia L. Saneholtz (Washington State University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 125. Proposal No. 125 is a piece of legislation whose time has not come. It would result in additional administrative nightmares with the potential for each sport to have a different 93-day recruiting period. Furthermore, this legislation is unnecessary. At the vast majority of our institutions, the sports impacted by this legislation do not have the recruiting budget of a magnitude allowing them to roam the country at will to recruit.

For most of these sports, the telephone is the primary recruitment tool, not the airplane. Often our coaches combine recruiting with team travel already scheduled. Institutional monitoring of this legislation would be an additional burden with the end not justifying the means. Peer monitoring would be impossible with more than 200 recruiting calendars in each sport. So, what is the point? This legislation would not solve any problems but create many. We can and do control these programs through the budget process and we do not need national legislation in this area.

[Proposal No. 125 (Page A-152) was defeated by Division I.]

Recruiting—Collect and Toll-Free Telephone Calls

Susan A. Collins (George Mason University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 126 on behalf of the NCAA Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is the Council's effort to confirm its position concerning the intent of Bylaw 13.1.2.4-(b)-(1), adopted at the 1991 Convention. The Council believes toll-free calls initiated by the prospect or the prospect's parent or legal guardian should receive the same treatment as collect calls. Calls to toll-free numbers can be made at the prospect's discretion and do not create additional recruiting pressure on the prospect. I urge your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 126 (Page A-154) was defeated by Division I, 154-155.]

Recruiting—Toll-Free Telephone Calls

Charles S. Harris (Arizona State University): On behalf of the sponsoring institutions, I move Proposal No. 127.

[The motion was seconded.]

iThe intent of this proposal is straightforward. It is designed to eliminate the use of toll-free, 1-800 telephone numbers for recruiting of the propose of

Dr. Nicholas Cassisi (University of Florida): I rise in opposition to Proposal No. 127 to eliminate the 1-800 number for recruiting because it also eliminates the 1-800 number for our customers. That is our fans. Our switchboard operators will be placed in a position of monitoring these calls. We are also in the customer-service business and this would also have the effect of hurting our ticket-buying public. It doesn't make good business sense to eliminate something that benefits 90 percent of the callers in order to prevent 10 percent of the callers from possible labuses. I urge your defeat.

Charles W. Ehrhardt (Florida State University): I rise in support of the proposal. Unless this proposal passes, we will be required by the stiff competition to all get 1-800 numbers. We don't want to have that extra expense.

[Proposal No. 127 (Page A-154) was approved by Division I, 185-

Recruiting—Telephone Calls

[NOTE: Proposal Nos. 128 and 129 were postponed from the Divisions I-A and I-AA business sessions to the Division I business session.]

. Dutch Baughman (Oregon State University): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, we were going to move this proposition yesterday. We believe the limited additional financial aid awards in football will establish a necessity for the coaching staff to have instant knowledge of the number of prospects who intend to sign the National Letter of Intent. The ability to contact prospects by telephone would enable the coaching staff to determine which prospects will sign the National Letter of Intent without compromising the philosophy of the dead period.

Frederick W. Obear (University of Tennessee, Chattanooga): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I stand in opposition to Proposal No. 128. Last year, as part of the reform package and for the first time in its history, the Association placed restrictions on recruiting telephone calls. The restrictions adopted were designed to reduce time pressures on coaches, prospective student-athletes and their parents. Since the adoption of that legislation, some of the restrictions on telephone calls have been fine-tuned based upon the recommendations of the Council's Subcommittee to Review the 1991 Reform Proposals. It was the charge to that committee to fine-tune the reform proposals without affecting the intent. The restrictions, as adopted and fine-tuned, are reasonable and modest and apply the same to all sports. This proposal would provide a special exception to the limit on telephone calls in the sport of football only. The rules limiting

2	1992 Convention Proceeding

football calls should be the same for all sports. We urge you not to vote for the adoption of this amendment.

[Proposal No. 128 (Page A-155) was approved by Division I-A and defeated by Division I-AA.]

Recruiting—Telephone Calls

Frederick W. Obear (University of Tennessee, Chattanooga): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 129. Proposal No. 129 adds a number of restrictions on telephone calls made by coaching staff members in the sport of football. This proposal technically could increase costs inasmuch as there is a particular time period during which telephone calls to prospects would be unlimited. The Presidents Commission urges the defeat of Proposal No. 129.

Charles M. Neinas (College Football Association): Mr. Chair, addressing this proposal on behalf of the 19 listed sponsors and not counted in that is AT&T. I hope I can reach out and touch someone because one of the problems we have at the NCAA Convention is sometimes decisions are made in isolation. So, hopefully, even though individual members of the Council and the Presidents Commission will pay heed, I would appreciate their consideration of individually voting in favor of No. 129 although you have heard that the Presidents Commission is in opposition.

No. 129 takes on added importance as a result of the failure to adopt No. 130 and the adoption of No. 131. So, if you view this particular proposal in that context, I think you will see that it is necessary to have more than one telephone call per week during the recruiting period. Let me remind the delegates, the members of the Presidents Commission, that football is the only sport that deals with an official grant limit. That is important to remember,

Now, this is truly fine-tuning. I don't think anyone will argue that unrestricted telephone calls were not the way to go. What we have seen now is the pendulum has swung so far the other way that it creates a dilemma for many coaches. As coach Paterno noted yesterday, sometimes he has to call in an assistant coach to find out if he can make a call to a prospect that week. No. 129 offers a compromise. Recognizing the need to restrict telephone contact and also to save money, there is a quiet period followed by a one-contact per week during the evaluation period. When you get to the recruiting period, then you should have the opportunity to contact those individuals who may be interested in attending your institution.

Again, please remember that football is the only sport with an initialgrant limit. What needs to be repeated here is the fact that there has been significant reform in football recruiting prior to the involvement of the Presidents Commission. At one time, we recruited off-campus in the sport of football more than 200 days. Football recruiting now is less than eight weeks. We need an opportunity to make contact with prospects. We would appreciate your support.

William W. Sutton (Mississippi Valley State University): Also

speaking on behalf of the Presidents Commission, we in the smaller Division I schools have a problem with the continuing cost rise and this would definitely add cost to our telephone bills. We cannot afford to increased costs and, therefore, we urge the defeat of Proposal No. 129.

Charles W. Ehrhardt (Florida State University): I rise in support of the proposal. We think that for this limited period these telephone contacts are necessary. I urge your approval.

[Proposal No. 129 (Page A-155) was defeated by Divisions I-A (55-57) and I-AA after a motion to postpone to the Division I business session.]

Reconsideration of Proposal No. 128

James Frank (Southwestern Athletic Conference): I was on the prevailing side of Proposal No. 128 and I would like to make a motion for reconsideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

David B. Wagner (Georgia Southern University): I think all of our colleagues in Division I-AA realize that our holster is pointed toward our foot and we are about ready to pull the trigger. So, I call the question and I think it is obvious that we are in an uncompetitive recruiting situation and we need to pass this legislation. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 128 (Page A-155) was approved by Division I-AA.]

Contacts Subsequent to Signing The National Letter of Intent

Vincent J. Dooley (University of Georgia): On behalf of the NCAA Recruiting Committee and the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 138.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 138 is a fine-tuning proposal that will help to clarify whether a member institution's coach may contact prospective student-athletes' relatives or legal guardians at the site of the prospective student-athlete's competition. The adoption of this proposal will eliminate NCAA Bylaw 13.1.4.4-(d), which precludes this type of contact during the dead period. There is no need to continue this restriction on contact during the dead period after a prospective student-athlete has signed a National Letter of Intent with the institution.

David Price (Pacific-10 Conference): This proposal is somewhat confusing. There are two separate, distinct issues here. The elimination of Subparagraph (b) refers to the dead period in all aspects for a prospect to sign a National Letter of Intent. Subparagraph (f) refers to coaches being able to sit with the parents of the prospects who may have signed a Letter of Intent but not during the dead period. To be able to address these individually, because the Pac-10 Conference supports the latter part of the proposal, which indeed is to be incorporated into the Manual as listed in Interpretation 16 on Page 196 of the Official Notice, but opposes the elimination of the dead period for these types of prospects, I move that issue be separated.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Duvisian I Business Commission	
Division I Business Session _	 295

Mr. Price: The elimination of subparagraph (b) would mean that during the dead period a prospect who signed a National Letter of Intent with an institution may be contacted off-campus away from the high school by coaches from that institution. Dead periods in general dother not allow in-person, on- or off-campus contact by coaching staff members. They are designed with two purposes in mind. One is to provide a sterile atmosphere for the prospective student-athlete in which to make his decision, his or her decision, in signing a Letter off Intent, and that obviously is not addressed here. The second purpose however, is to protect coaches during times of the National Basketball Coaches Association meetings, national championships and Christmask vacations. We believe that the principle of no recruiting contacts during the dead period should be preserved and that the dead period should not become the last-gasp period. We urge your defeat of this proposal:

[Proposal No. 138, Subparagraph (b) (Page A-165) was defeated by Division I. Subparagraph (f) was adopted, after a successful motion to divide the proposal.]

Institutional Stationery

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): I would like to move Proposal No. 139.

The motion was seconded.

One of the real joys on the Interpretations Committee this past year has been sorting out the interpretations on stationery, some of which are identified on Page 200 in the program. One concern from institutions that seemed to have some merit was that those institutions that purchased institutional stationery where there were simply changes in department head from the department of chemistry, department of intercollegiate athletics, the president's office, those institutions indicated that actually going to one-color stationery could have been a cost increase. The world didn't end when we went to one color. The world won't end when we go to two. It seems to be an option to allow the purple and golds, green and golds, red and blues, whatever, to be put back on the stationery. We urge your support.

[Proposal No. 139 (Page A-166) was approved by Division I.]

Distribution of Graduation-Rates Report

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 140.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal clarifies institutional responsibilities related to the distribution of graduation-rates information to prospective student athletes and other interested parties. As we know, members of Division I submitted enrollment and graduation-rates information to the NCAA. national office last fall. This coming spring, after the information is compiled and checked, each institution will receive a two-page report that summarizes its enrollment and graduation data. Each institution will then distribute this report as specified in the legislation.

Proposal No. 140 will help ensure that the distribution of the report is consistent with the Federal Student-Athlete Right To Know Act

because, like the act, it specifies that the reports must be provided to a prospective student-athlete's guidance office as well as to the prospect, the prospect's parents and the prospect's coaches. The proposal also clarifies that the report must be provided at the earliest opportunity during the recruiting process or upon request consistent with the spirit of the act or the intent behind the Association's original legislation relating to this matter. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support.

Resolution: Division I Championships Eligibility Carl F. Ullrich (Patriot League): I move Proposal No. 149.

[The motion was seconded.]

Please recognize that this is not identical to the resolution that was proposed last year—I believe it was No. 150—in that there is an extra 12 months involved in this proposal for sports committees to look at the possibility of a conference champion being involved in some way, not in any kind of mandated automatic qualification, but in some way to regionals or finals or whatever to be able to dream about participating in a national championship. I urge you to vote for this proposal, which mandates nothing and gives our sports committees, which I think all of the proposal of the confidence in, the responsibility to look at this possibility.

Eugene F. Corrigan (Atlantic Coast Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Executive Committee, I urge defeat of this proposal. A similar resolution was defeated convincingly in 1991 because the feeling is that it is contrary to the same principles and philosophies of the NCAA championship competition. Participation in NCAA championships is a privilege earned by deserving teams and individuals on the basis of their competitive merits. Championships are not intended to cover all tournaments or meets; they are intended to provide national competition among the best eligible students and teams.

While there may be some merit in studying some of the processes of this resolution for selective sports, the process for doing so already is in place. The sports committees that believe these considerations are appropriate for their championships can so recommend to the Executive Committee. To mandate this may not be appropriate for all championships and could very well effect the quality of the championship competition. The Executive Committee and the Division I Championships Committees intend to extend their August 1992 meeting by a full day to discuss this and other issues related to the championship programs and its directions.

It does not appear to the Executive Committee that there is unanimity among conferences, sports committees, divisions or institutions on this particular issue; and therefore, we urge your defeat of Proposal No. 149. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 149 (Page A-175) was defeated by Division I.]

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

[NOTE: The slate for Division I representatives to the Council was presented and approved.]

[The Division I business session was adjourned at 9:45 a.m.]

Division I Business Session

7.1	 2 54
oceedings	
occumes	ŧ.,

NCAA Honors Dinner

Wednesday Evening, January 8, 1992

President Sweet: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the Association's 27th annual honors dinner. Please rise and remain standing for the invocation. It will be presented by Martha Hawthorne of Rice University, a member of the NCAA Executive Committee.

INVOCATION

Martha E. Hawthorne (Rice University): Let us pray. Father, we joyfully come together tonight to recognize outstanding men and women. Their lives and accomplishments demonstrate dedication to life's higher ideals and purposes. Enable us to see your hand in these individuals and in all mankind, and to know that all things are in your hands. Father, may your wisdom, understanding, patience and love direct us as we deliberate and decide the matters before us at this Convention, and may we leave here knowing that we, too, have demonstrated life's higher ideals and purposes. Now, thank you for this meal and for the infinite goodness of life. Amen.

SPECIAL INTRODUCTIONS

President Sweet: I know that some of you have not finished your dessert. With your indulgence, I will begin our program. Please continue eating while I make some preliminary remarks and present some of our head table guests.

I have been looking forward to tonight's program for some time. Like many of you, I long have considered our honors dinner to be one of the most special highlights of our annual Convention.

We of course annually meet at this Convention to address issues that will define the administration of our intercollegiate programs in the future. This opportunity to focus our attention on the outstanding men and women who have represented our institutions of higher learning in competitive athletics rekindles our desire to administer our programs with maximum integrity at the highest level possible, within the philosophies that have been established by each of our three divisions.

Whether the competition be in the Final Four or the Division III tennis championships, our goals are the same. We want to administer the best amateur athletics programs in the world within the framework of higher education. The benefits that accrue to the student-athletes who represent our institutions are best exemplified by those whom we will honor tonight. They join a distinguished roster of former honorees. They no doubt will be joined by others in the future who also will experience the unique values that competition, goal-setting, teamwork and striving for excellence can have in molding one's character.

They represent all of our student-athletes who have met similar challenges to fully develop their talents academically, athletically and socially. These whom we honor tonight represent the very best from two specific years—those who completed their eligibility during the past calendar year and those who have distinguished themselves since graduating from their respective institutions 25 years ago.

Additionally, we salute one former letter winner who has reached the highest level of distinction with exceptional dedication and achievement. While our honorees change each year, our charge as administrators and coaches of intercollegiate athletics programs remains constant.

'We must continue to ensure that the interests of the student-athlete as a college student remain foremost. We must administer our programs consistent with the goals and structure of higher education,

These whom we honor tonight certainly have met the challenge to be an integral part of the total community. They have excelled in all areas. While they are exceptional, I choose not to think that they are exceptions. Instead, I reflect upon their accomplishments as the norm-although theirs is at the highest level-for thousands of men and women who participate in our programs.

While the public often dwells on the negatives associated with intercollegiate athletics, and there are some, it is important that we reinforce the benefits of our programs and maintain a positive focus on the outstanding athletes who participate in them. It is important that the negatives are countered with our many positives. It is important that we all are committed to aggressively delivering a positive message about our intercollegiate programs, the students who participate in them and their value in higher education.

By honoring these outstanding men and women tonight, we spotlight the many values of intercollegiate athletics, their positive influences on our campuses and communities and on our nation. By permitting us to honor them, they bring great honor to us and they encourage us to reaffirm our commitment to providing the greatest academic and athletics opportunities possible for the men and women on our

At this time, I wish to introduce individuals sharing the dais who will not be specifically acknowledged later in our program. On my left is our secretary-treasurer, who has represented you well in a number of demanding activities during the past year. It is my pleasure to introduce to you Mr. B. J. Skelton, the dean of admissions and administration and vice-provost at Clemson University. (Applause)

The chair of the NCAA Honors Committee, which is responsible for selecting our honorees and coordinating this dinner, a former NCAA president, John R. Davis from Oregon State University. Jack Davis. (Applause)

It is hard to believe that the next individual has been serving as the NCAA executive director for 41/2 years. It is with particular pride that

_ 1992 Convention Proceedings	ď	ì
-------------------------------	---	---

Honors Dinner ___

I have the opportunity to present to you Dick Schultz. (Applause)

Our master of ceremonies today is the first to move from the Silver. Anniversary seating area to the dais from which I speak. He also is the first member of the NCAA Honors Committee to vote on our honorees and then present them at our dinner. I thought he might be the first master of ceremonies to arrive with flowers but...

To many television viewers, he still is known as Father Murphy. To some, he is that man who sells flowers for FTD florists. To some, he is one of television's top sports analysts. To all of us, he is recognized as one of the most outstanding linemen who ever played college or professional football.

Merlin Olsen was a consensus all-American at Utah State University and received the Outland Trophy as college football's outstanding lineman. Merlin was selected to the Walter Camp College Football Team of the Century.

He also was a three-time academic all-American selection. Her graduated summa cum laude with a 3.640 grade-point average as a finance major, was a National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame scholar-athlete, and earned Pi Kappa Phi honors.

Merlin twice was president of his class and was named the top student in the college of business his final three years at Utah State.

He was the No. 1 draft choice of the Los Angeles Rams and was selected the NFL's defensive rookie of the year. Merlin played 15 professional seasons while establishing an NFL record with 14 appearances in the Pro Bowl game. He was selected to the Quarter-Century all-NFL/AFL Team for the years 1960 to 1985, and to the NFL's Team of the Decade for both the 1960s and the 1970s.

When that career ended, he became a television star with key roles on "Little House on the Prairie," "Father Murphy," "Fathers and Sons," and "Aaron's Way." He also became one of television's most respected color commentators, first for NBC and for the last several years at CBS.

Merlin participates in numerous fund-raising and charitable organizations. He is involved in Child Help USA, which works with battered and abused children, and he is vice-president of the board of trustees for the Multiple Sclerosis Society.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to introduce to you a member of the NCAA Honors Committee and tonight's master of ceremonies, Merlin Olsen. (Applause)

SPECIAL RECOGNITION

Merlin J. Olsen: Thank you, Judy. I am delighted to be here but I have to tell you that no self-respecting flower salesman would ever dare show up without a floral bouquet of some kind. So here it is. (Applause)

I know that there are a few coaches here who are on diets. I wasn't watching you eat this evening. The way I found out was a little unusual. I was busy doing these arrangements for the dais. When you give up your day job you have to concentrate on the other things that you have. I was working on a table over here that had quite a lot of traffic coming by. I walked away to do something else. When I looked back, one of the

300 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

coaches had drifted in and had taken a look at some of these flowers. He reached down and grabbed a couple of those flowers and stuffed them in his mouth and ate them. I was pretty upset about that. In fact, I have been looking for that guy all night long. I can tell you this wherever you are. You might get away with eating my gerbera daisies, but those altheas are going to give you diarrhea. (Laughter)

I have been delighted to have the opportunity to serve on the Honors Committee. It has been a wonderful opportunity for me to get involved at a level that is very exciting. When I was asked to serve, it certainly seemed to me like a very easy assignment. Was I wrong about that. It truly has been a challenge to sort through the incredible success stories of current and former student-athletes. After being a part of this process, I can tell you that I really do treasure my own Silver Anniversary Award, which I was fortunate to receive six years ago, even more now than I did at that time.

I am humbled by the success of those who have been nominated, especially by our current student-athletes. I guess one reason for that is I have been resensitized in a way by having an 18-year old son who is a freshman football player at Stanford. Nathan has given me a chance to reexamine the amount of time demanded from these young people to give me a sense of the incredible external pressures that are applied to our student-athletes. And of course, mixed in with that is their own very powerful scholastic and athletics motivation.

This has been a delightful evening for me, having a chance in particular to see some old friends and enemies. I never had any question about some men's ability on the football field. I learned about that firsthand. But in reading their resumes and having a chance to be a part of this process, I have gained even more respect for their other accomplishments in life. I think it is exciting that our honorees can have their families and friends here to help them with this and to share this special evening with them. It does make it that much more pleasurable and exciting. I am impressed by all of our Silver Anniversary recipients. I would encourage our young student-athletes to take note of the way they have used their competitive drive, their success in the classroom and in sports as a springboard to new challenges and new opportunities. I also will tell you that our recipients of these Silver Anniversary Awards are not unique. There are many of our former student-athletes out there taking the lead as we look at new ways to reshape our tomorrow in this nation. As I look around this room, I wonder if those of you here truly understand the powerful impact that you have on the real leaders of our future—our gifted young people.

How carefully they watch and listen to you. I would challenge you to continue to encourage them to be inquisitive and adventurous in their thinking and to assist them in setting high goals. At the same time, I would have to tell you with disappointment that all of the messages that they are receiving from you are not positive. How can we ask our student-athletes to climb when some of us are showing them the holes in the fence? How can we challenge them to maintain their integrity

	30:
nore Dinner	

when their role models are shortcutting the rules? I said earlier that young people do listen to their coaches. I can prove that by sharing with you one of the favorite sayings of one of my old coaches, Chuck Knox, who is the new Rams coach again as of today. He borrowed this particular saying from Walt Whitman, I believe. Essentially, he said: "What you do speaks so loudly I cannot hear what you say." What we do indeed does speak so loudly that our voices often are not heard. I would think the challenge for each of us here tonight is to work diligently to make certain that the message we are sending is one that we can be proud of.

Ladies and gentlemen, in addition to our usual complement of awards, the Association can offer special recognition to worthy individ-

uals. It now is time to do just that.

One year ago, current and former student-athletes were in the Middle East participating in Operation Desert Storm. Individuals who have represented NCAA institutions long have served our nation's armed forces with distinction, particularly during times of international conflict. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who was commander-in-chief of the Allied Forces in both the African and European theaters in World War II, and Omar Bradley, whose 12th Army in Europe was the largest body of American soldiers to serve under one officer, were generals of the Army, Vice-Admiral William P. Lawrence lived in isolation all except for a month and a half during his seven years as a prisoner of war in Vietnam. Each of these three received the NCAA's Theodore Roosevelt Award. Student-athletes who had earned the nation's highest military medal, the Congressional Medal of Honor, were recognized for service with valor during this program in 1971.

Many of the men and women who participated in the Persian Gulf have returned to their respective campuses to complete their eligibility with waivers granted by the Association. Such waivers permitted them to interrupt their academic and athletics pursuits to serve our country.

Here to represent these men and women tonight is Scott Thomas. who earned consensus all-American honors as a defensive halfback at the Air Force Academy in 1985. Captain Thomas flew 38 combat missions over Iraq in his F-16 fighter, primarily bombing petroleum refineries and ammunition stations. On his 35th mission, his fighter had an engine malfunction about 40 miles from touchdown and began losing fuel and altitude. The cockpit filled with smoke and he was forced to eject. For 45 minutes, he endured a severe thunderstorm. He then spent another 75 minutes behind enemy lines waiting for allied troops to rescue him. He flew three more missions after his rescue and accumulated 120 hours of combat time. Captain Thomas was awarded three air combat and aerial achievement medals and was greeted by President Bush on his return home.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my distinct pleasure to present to you as a representative of all student-athletes who served in the Persian Gulf War, Captain Scott Thomas of the United States Air Force Academy. (Applause)

1992 Convention Proceedings

Captain Thomas will receive a Special Recognition Award from Vice-Admiral William Lawrence, a member of the NCAA Honors Committee and the 1984 Teddy Award recipient. (Applause)

Captain Thomas will respond on behalf of all current and former

student-athletes who served in Operation Desert Storm.

Captain Scott A. Thomas: Thank you very much. I am really grateful to have had the opportunity to experience college football at the Air Force Academy. In fact, while sitting alone in no man's land in Iraq with an unidentified enemy nearby, I got the feeling that I had been in that situation before. Those of you from BYU can figure it out.

More seriously, speaking for all students who served in Operation Desert Storm, intercollegiate athletics taught us many skills that proved to be invaluable in combat. First of all, we learned that the team is always bigger than ourselves. We also learned or we found the discipline to practice a trade effectively, especially when others weren't watching. We also learned to make timely decisions under stress. We had to live with the consequences of those decisions whether they were good or bad.

Most importantly, it gave us the confidence to step forward and to be leaders while others sat in hesitation. I accept this award on behalf of each and every one of us who served in Operation Desert Storm. Thank

you. (Applause)

Mr. Olsen: At this time, I would like to call your attention to your program to review the list of student-athletes who have been named Walter Byers Scholars and those who have received NCAA postgraduate scholarships during the past year.

The NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship Program began in 1964. Since that time, the Association has invested more than \$4 million in postgraduate scholarships to more than 2,200 student-athletes. We congratulate each of these outstanding student-athletes and the

institutions that they represent.

The College Athletics Top XII permits the Association to honor six outstanding student-athletes from the preceding year and six former letter-winners who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions on their silver anniversary as college graduates. The criteria for each of these categories are listed in your program. I now take great pleasure in introducing the current student-athletes to you.

Ty H. Detmer, Brigham Young University, Football.

If our next guest looks a little tired to you, there is a good reason. He has been in Tokyo this week preparing for Saturday's Japan Bowl and flew across the Pacific today to join us. Most sports fans will acknowledge that for the past decade the football programs at Brigham Young University have been represented by some of the nation's best college quarterbacks. A quick glance at the NCAA records book indicates that the best of those athletes who have created this reputation is BYU's Ty Detmer. Well, it really takes more than a glance. This two-time consensus all-American quarterback received college football's highest honor—the Heisman Trophy. He established 62 NCAA total offense

Honois Dinner ____

and passing records during his career. I will not attempt to recite all of his records. After all, he does have to board the next flight to Tokyo. But I will highlight a few. Ty passed for 14,653 yards and 116 touchdowns during his career. He threw for almost 5,200 yards and 41 scores as a junior. Ty threw at least four touchdown passes in 11 games. And he passed for more than 500 yards in five games.

Some will argue about his best individual game. But many will agree that it was either his final regular-season performance against San Diego State when he threw for 574 yards and six touchdowns, or in the 1989 Holiday Bowl when he passed for 576 yards against Penn State.

While these feats have made Ty a national football personality, he is known on campus and in Provo as an excellent student. He had a perfect 4.000 grade-point average last spring and was actively involved in charities, his community and his church. He was the first sophomore elected captain of his football team and his commitment to being a proper role model for children is exemplified each week when he teaches a class for eight-year-olds who attend his church.

Ty will receive his award from Rex E. Lee, president of Brigham Young University.

Gea Johnson, Arizona State University, Track and Field.

Even the most casual fan of track and field considers the decathlon a special event. The winner, especially in Olympic competition, is considered one of the world's greatest athletes. The companion event in women's competition is the heptathlon. Gea Johnson rapidly is earning an international reputation for excellence in this demanding sport.

Gea, who won the NCAA championship as a junior, had her dream to defend her national title shattered before the Pacific-10 Conference championship last year when she sustained an injury that prematurely ended her collegiate career. Her competitive future, however, remains positive. She will be a favorite to represent the United States in the 1992 Olympic Games.

An academic all-American who established eight records at Arizona State, Gea won Pac-10 championships in both the heptathlon and the long jump and was second in the 100-meter hurdles. She has participated in the World University Games as well as the Goodwill Games. Gea established a 3.970 grade-point average majoring in communications, was named to the Phi Kappa Phi Honorary and was elected to the Golden Key Honor Society. She was selected one of the Outstanding College Students of America and was named the Outstanding Graduate for the College of Public Programs.

She is an active speaker for high schools and elementary schools, an Arizona Senior Olympics volunteer, and has devoted much of her time assisting the Salvation Army in distributing food to the homeless. Gea has been a featured speaker for Drug Abuse Resistance Education and Athletics Against Drugs and Alcohol. For the past four years, she has been a Sunday school teacher at her church.

Gea will receive her award from Lattie F. Coor, president of Arizona State University.

Janet Kruse, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Volleyball.

The people at the University of Nebraska learned four years ago that Janet Kruse was a very special individual. She had established an outstanding athletics and academic record in high school and she promptly began building on those successes in her collegiate environment. In her first year, she was an impact hitter in volleyball, earning all-Big Eight Conference honors and recording 18 kills in her best game against NCAA champion Texas. But more importantly, she established a perfect 4.000 grade-point average and received the Delta Gamma Outstanding Freshman Award.

Four years later, the entire international volleyball community has become familiar with Janet. She twice has been named the nation's player of the year, earned all-American honors three consecutive years, was selected to the all-conference team each of her four varsity seasons, and played in three consecutive U.S. Olympic Festivals. Janet was the first Nebraska junior to reach the 1,000-kill plateau and she was the first true sophomore in Big Eight Conference history to earn all-American recognition.

Janet's success in the classroom has matched her pace of excellence in volleyball. She has established a 3.897 grade-point average majoring in biological science. For her first six semesters at Nebraska, the Mortarboard selection's official transcript includes 25 grades of A, including 13 As with a plus. Her leadership qualities have been recognized in a number of ways. She was selected the Nebraska Female Student Leader of the Year. She serves on the university's health center governing board, is active in the Sheriff Department's Drug Awareness Program and she is an officer in the Delta Gamma sorority. In her spare time, just in case you were wondering, Janet is an accomplished musician who often plays the piano and organ at weddings. She also happens to be the organist for her church.

Janet will receive her award from Graham Spanier, chancellor of the University of Nebraska. Lincoln.

Joy Selig, Oregon State University, Gymnastics.

It would have been easy for Joy Selig's promising gymnastics career to have ended at the start of her junior season at Oregon State University. She earned the title of NCAA champion the preceding spring and entered her first match of the year shouldering an abundance of self-imposed pressures to excel in all events in order to lead the Beavers to a possible national title.

But Joy's first meet of her junior season was a total disaster. She experienced one of those days that often strike athletes at least once in their careers. Joy twice fell from the uneven bars. Her timing was so bad in the floor exercise that she suffered whiplash and hurt her elbo. In her final event of the evening, Joy twice fell from the balance beam. For one of the few times since being inspired at age five to pursue gymnastics after watching Olga Korbut on television in the 1972 Olympics, she left the arena doubting her personal abilities and feeling she was letting her teammates down.

onors .	Dinner	

But turning to a strong spiritual faith and the sensitive and motivational coaching of Jim Turpin, she mounted a personal comeback to win national championships on the balance beam and in floor exercise. Last season's Pacific-10 gymnast of the year, the team captain ranked first nationally and established national collegiate records in both all-around and floor exercise and earned all-American honors in seven events. She completed her career winning a record eight Pacification titles and three NCAA championships. She also participated in the World University Games.

An academic all-American, Joy established a 3.500 grade-point average majoring in psychology and was elected to Phi Kappa Phi Honorary. Active in numerous extracurricular activities, she has devoted extensive time to motivating children to improve reading habits. Joy is a participant in the Big Brother/Big Sister program and the Fellowship of Christian Athletes and has made many anti-drug presentations to local schools. She currently is working on a master's degree at Oregon State and serves as an assistant gymnastics coach.

Joy will receive her award from John V. Byrne, president of Oregon State University.

Brad Werenka, Northern Michigan University, Ice Hockey.

When Northern Michigan earned a berth in the 1989 National Collegiate Division I Ice Hockey Championship, winning a national title became a realistic goal for Brad Werenka and his teammates. Northern Michigan was no stranger to the NCAA championship. The

Wildcats had appeared in consecutive championships in the 1980s and had built one of the nation's premier ice hockey programs.

Brad, an academic all-American who established a 3.600 grade-point average majoring in political science, bypassed the opportunity for early graduation and a potential professional career to utilize a remaining season of eligibility and assist the Wildcats in reaching their goal. And assist he did. More accurately, the team's captain had the best season of his career in 1991, earning all-American honors and leading Northern Michigan to its first NCAA Championship.

Brad earned all-tournament honors and finished second in the balloting for the Hobey Baker Award, which annually is presented to the nation's outstanding player. He ranked first nationally in scoring for a defenseman and set school records with 20 goals, 43 assists and 63

points.

Brad was selected for membership in the Mortarboard and Golden Key. A Special Olympics and American Cancer Society volunteer, he initiated a "can-a-thon" for needy people during the Christmas holidays.

Brad will receive his award from Richard B. Comley, athletics director and head ice hockey coach at Northern Michigan University.

David L. Wharton, University of Southern California, Swimming.

David Wharton is one of the best swimmers in the world. While track has the decathlon and heptathlon to identify the best all-round performers in that sport, the individual medley provides comparable

________1992 Convention Proceedings

recognition in swimming. The medley requires the competitors to utilize the four basic strokes that are contested in meets throughout the world.

The individual medley has become synonymous with David Wharton's name. He became the first athlete to win the NCAA championship in the 400-yard medley four consecutive years. He won national titles in the 200-yard event three consecutive years. Only three other swimmers ever have won an individual event four consecutive years in the NCAA championships. Twice named the NCAA Swimmer of the Year, he has established world, American and NCAA records in both the 400- and 200-yard individual medley. He won a silver medal in the longer race at the 1988 Olympic Games. There is no doubt that David will be one of the favorites to earn medals for the United States at the games this summer.

Although David's swimming successes are well known, many people are unaware that he has been handicapped since age 1½ with a hearing loss that has required him to wear sound-amplification aids for both ears. This loss, however, has not impeded any of his dreams to excel in all areas of his life.

An NCAA postgraduate scholarship honoree, David established a B average majoring in business administration and currently is enrolled in Southern California's graduate school. A member of USC's Skull and Dagger Honor Society, David devotes much of his time to conducting clinics for age-group swimmers and Boy Scouts in San Diego and his hometown, Philadelphia. David also visits local schools for the deaf and is learning sign language to better communicate with children.

David will receive his award from Steven B. Sample, president of

We would like to ask Janet Kruse to please respond on behalf of these current student-athletes.

Janet L. Kruse: Good evening. On behalf of the NCAA Top Six honorees, I would like to thank the NCAA and extend my congratulations to my fellow recipients. It truly is an honor to be standing before you tonight in such distinguished company as the Honorable Jack Kemp, Captain Thomas and the Silver Anniversary honorees.

As I am certain my fellow recipients would agree, being a studentathlete throughout our collegiate careers has provided us many opportunities not afforded to many students. The NCAA and our institutions have allowed us to mature both athletically and academically, strengthening our character through many learning experiences.

The successes we have achieved have come through hard work, dedication and continual support. On behalf of the six athletes I represent, I wish to extend our gratitude to the NCAA, the athletics directors and their departments, coaches, family, and friends who provided us the opportunity to fulfill the goals that we have placed before ourselves, both in the classroom and in our sports. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Olsen: Thank you, Janet. Congratulations to you and to each of

lonors Dinner	 	 30

the other honorees. I will have to tell you after reading your biographies and having a chance to meet you this evening, I am confident of one thing for sure—the best is yet to come from this dynamic group of the young people.

It now is time to salute the Silver Anniversary honorees.

R. Malcolm Graham, New York University, Basketball.

It could have been easy for Mal Graham to accept the erroneous perception that a promising career in professional basketball would negate the importance of pursuing a quality education while he was attending New York University. After all, he was one of the nation's premier basketball players and everyone knew that he would be a first.

round draft choice.

Mal ranked third nationally in scoring his senior season with a 28.7 average. He holds the school record in career scoring with a healthy 22 points per-game average. He scored over 40 points six times and more than 30 points in 19 games. He earned a gold medal in the 1967 World

University Games.

An all-American in the classroom too, Mal was the recipient of an academic key for outstanding achievement in business writing and speaking. He was a first-round draft choice of the Boston Celtics, made the all-rookie team and helped win two world championships before illness ended his athletics career. When that day came, Mal was prepared academically to pursue another career. He graduated from the Boston College law school in 1974 with distinction as an Earl Warren Scholar. Mal was a practicing attorney for eight years until he was appointed as an associate justice of a state district court for four years before receiving a seat on the Massachusetts Superior Court, where he continues to serve today.

Judge Graham has made many significant contributions to the state judicial system. He is responsible for the hiring and supervision of all superior court probation officers, serves on a special committee that is administering the nation's first stress-management program designed especially for judges, and is president of the Massachusetts Black Judges Conference. Judge Graham has devoted numerous hours to Boston's educational system and is a trustee of Boston College High School.

Mal has received the Award of Merit from the Boston College law school, served on the board of the oldest art society in the United States, is active in the Black/Jewish Leadership Mission to Israel and also is a member of the NYU Hall of Fame.

Judge Graham will receive his award from Daniel E. Quilty, athletics director at New York University.

Robert A. Griese, Purdue University, Football.

When Bob Griese graduated from Mundi High School in Evansville, Indiana, few who had followed his career would have had the foresight to suggest that 25 years later he would be considered one of the greatest quarterbacks in football history. These fans were aware that Bob was legally blind in his right eye; that he lacked the size, speed, quickness

and arm speed required to be a starting quarterback in the Big Ten Conference. They even knew that he could not properly throw a football.

became one of the most proficient quarterbacks in college and professional football history. A two-time all-American at Purdue, he led the Boilermakers to their only Rose Bowl appearance and a 14-13 victory over Southern Cal. The industrial economics major finished his career ranked seventh in NCAA total offense and established eight career, seven season and five single-game records at Purdue. Bob averaged 6.9 yards every time he touched the football and led the Big Ten in both total offense and scoring. He completed more than 60 percent of his pass attempts as a senior and kicked 75 of 86 extra points during his career.

Drafted in the first round by Miami, he helped make the Dolphins one of the most successful franchises in professional football. During his 14-year career, he passed for more than 25,000 yards and 192 touchdowns and played in six Pro Bowl and two all-star games. Bob led his team to three consecutive Super Bowl appearances and two NFL championships. The Dolphins finished the 1972 season with a perfect 17-0 record and were the last NFL team to compile an unbeaten season.

Since his retirement as an active player, Bob has continued to utilize his vast knowledge of football. Today he is one of the most respected football analysts in broadcasting and teams with Keith Jackson on ABC college football telecasts. Bob is president of the Miami Chapter of the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame and is an active member of the Orange Bowl committee.

Bob will receive his award from George S. King Jr., athletics director at Purdue University.

Floyd Little, Syracuse University, Football.

It is not unusual for the faithful fans of a university to reminisce about the triumphs of outstanding athletes who have worn a particular jersey number in a sport. But even when the most casual followers of college football begin talking about the great running backs in the game's history, anecdotes and comparisons almost always are directed first to jersey No. 44, and then to the three all-Americans who wore that number at Syracuse University.

Floyd Little knows the aura of wearing No. 44 first created by Jim Brown and then by the late Ernie Davis. It was his predecessor, Davis, who convinced him to inherit the famed number. While Gen. Douglas MacArthur was attempting to influence Floyd to accept an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy, Davis—the Heisman Trophy winner—talked to him about the value of a Syracuse education and the friendships he had established with both students and faculty. Floyd Little, the future College Football Hall of Famer, decided he too would wear No. 44.

Coach Ben Schwartzwalder considered Floyd the team's best athlete

and had started him on defense in his first varsity game. But three days before Syracuse played Kansas, led by Gale Sayers, the legendary coach moved Floyd from defense to offense. He responded by scoring five touchdowns and gaining 254 total yards. The three-time all-American was a do-it-all running back. He had over 2,700 yards in career rushing, including 12 games when he ran for more than 100 yards. He scored four or more touchdowns in three games, led the nation in all-purpose yards, was the punt and kickoff returner, and was one of the team's leading pass receivers.

Selected to the American Football League all-star team seven consecutive years, he earned all-pro distinction for Denver three times and twice led the National Football League in rushing before he retired in 1975. He averaged six yards every time he touched the football and continued to return punts and kickoffs throughout his professional career. A member of the College Football Hall of Fame, today Floyd owns one of the largest automobile dealerships in the Pacific Northwest and has dealerships in Denver and two California cities as well.

Floyd has received many awards for his contributions to his community and his country. He received a special citation from the American Jewish Committee Appeal for Human Relations, was a volunteer probation officer, and has served on the board of trustees for the Clayton College for Boys and the Denver Boys Club, among numerous other activities.

Floyd will receive his award from John J. Crouthamel, athletics director at Syracuse University.

James R. Lynch, University of Notre Dame, Football.

Perhaps one of the best testimonies to the leadership qualities that long have contributed to Jim Lynch's success is the fact he was, scheduled to speak on that subject today at the United States Naval Academy rather than standing before you to receive an award. The ultimate tribute comes not from this circumstance, but from the fact that Jim was invited to speak to the Middies by his brother, Tom, of all people, who is the superintendent of the Naval Academy. As most of you can attest, although we take great pride in our families, generally one must be exceptional—or the only person available—for a member of our family to give us a public forum for any reason. We are pleased that Tom released Jim from that obligation to allow him to join us today.

A two-time all-American linebacker, Jim was captain of the national championship Irish in 1966. He was voted the outstanding football player in the nation by the Maxwell Club, the last lineman to earn that distinction, and was named the outstanding lineman in the country by the Washington, D.C., Touchdown Club. He played in the East-West Shrine Game and the coaches' all-America game and served as the captain of the college all-star team that played the world champion Green Bay Packers. The academic all-American and National Football League Hall of Fame scholar-athlete was active in extracurricular activities at Notre Dame and spent one summer working with native Indians in Peru.

1992 Convention Proceedings

He joined the Kansas City Chiefs after his graduation and was a starting linebacker for 11 years before he retired. During that time, he played in the all-star game, was selected all-pro, helped Kansas City win the NFL championship in Super Bowl IV, and earned himself induction into the Chiefs' hall of fame. While playing professional football, he became an institutional stock broker for six years during the off-season before becoming vice-president of a food brokerage

Jim generously donates his time to a variety of worthy causes. He has served on the boards for Catholic Charities, the Notre Dame de Sion High School and Children's Mercy Hospital. He also has served as chair of the metropolitan area's March of Dimes Walk-A-Thon. He also has been an American Royal Governor and is a member of both Friends of the Zoo and the Kansas City Museum. Jim has been a successful fund-traiser for the Dream Factory, public television and the Special Olympics, among others.

Jim will receive his award from Richard A. Rosenthal, athletics director at the University of Notre Dame.

Alan Page, University of Notre Dame, Football.

In the state of Minnesota, Alan Page quickly is relinquishing his reputation as a great professional and college football player. Instead, he has become one of the state's leading attorneys and a prominent spokesperson exhorting the values of a quality education.

Like his Notre Dame teammate, Jim Lynch, Alan was an all-American. Now you understand why the Irish won the national championship in 1966. He was the first-round draft choice of the Minnesota Vikings and played 11 seasons for the Vikings and four seasons for Chicago before he retired. During that time, he became the first defensive player named the most valuable player in the NFL, earned all-pro distinction eight times and started in the last 215 games of his 218-game career. Alan also established Minnesota records for tackles, career sacks, blocked punts and place kicks, and recovered fumbles. He was selected the National Football Conference defensive player of the year four times and was elected to the professional football hall of fame in 1988.

After his retirement, he turned to law. First in private practice and then as an assistant attorney general for the state of Minnesota. These significant accomplishments have been overshadowed by his contributions to society. Alan founded the Page Educational Foundation to assist minority and other disadvantaged youths. He was appointed to the University of Minnesota board of regents and serves on the executive committee for Artists and Athletes against Apartheid. Alan is a member of the League of Women Voters Advisory Board, a director for the Minneapolis Urban League and has served as chair of the state's Negro College Fund.

Although Alan has been a distinguished representative for many of his old defensive football players, he also has had two accomplishments that some may think represent the antithesis for those of us who played

onors	

on that side of the football. He became the first professional football player to run a marathon and just a few years ago he completed a 62-mile race.

Alan will receive his award from Reverend E. William Beauchamp, executive vice-president of the University of Notre Dame.

Ricardo M. Urbina, Georgetown University, Track and Field.

There is little doubt that many of the social experiences that have influenced the judicial philosophies of Ricardo Urbina were developed while he was a student at Georgetown University.

While he was gaining fame as an all-American middle-distance runner, necessity meant he had to work as a part-time waiter and a guitar-playing folk singer in coffee houses around the Capitol. He also helped distribute food to the needy during Thanksgiving and Christmas drives and served as a tutor for inner-city kids.

A two-time all-American, his greatest personal athletics moments, probably were winning the NCAA 880-yard championship and setting a record in the 1,000 at Madison Square Garden.

Ricardo began his career as a trial attorney for the public defender service. He was successful in 49 of the 50 cases that he presented to a jury. He then was in private practice for two years and was voted professor of the year after joining Howard University's faculty as the director of its criminal justice program. Since beginning as the presiding judge for the family division of the District of Columbia Superior Court, he has restructured its processing of paternity and child-support cases, instituted a court-interpreter system for the foreign-born and hearing-impaired, and he also fostered a partnership between Georgetown and the juvenile probation division of the court to permit students to work with young offenders during the rehabilitation process.

The district's first Hispanic judge has been recognized for outstanding leadership and service in the prevention of child abuse and neglect. He also is a former Washingtonian of the Year.

Judge Urbina will receive his award from Francis X. Rienzo, athletics director at Georgetown University.

Responding on behalf of the Silver Anniversary honorees is Alan Page.

Alan C. Page: Let me begin by saying thank you to the NCAA for honoring us. It indeed is a unique honor; something that I believe none of us strives for but when it happens we all are pleased.

I looked at this group of honorees and I said: "Well, it happens to be six men this year. Maybe it will be six women next year." I am sure there are six women out there who have accomplished as much, if not more than we have. But in reality, we simply are symbolic of the many former intercollegiate athletes, both male and female, across this country who have gone on to make a contribution to our society. I thank you on behalf of all these men and women.

I also would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the support of family and friends who allow us the success that we have had. When you look

Satius, we are a diverse group. Six individuals from six different backgrounds. We are diverse by race, by geographics, by vocation. We have one common bond, however, and that common bond is education. We were prepared in the classroom long before we became athletes. When we became intercollegiate athletes, we continued to use that education. We have continued to use that education now that our splaying days are over.

Education is the underlying basis for whatever success we have. Athletics may have opened some doors that might not otherwise have been opened. But it is education that allows us to choose between which doors to walk in. No matter what we accomplish in life, no matter what we have to accomplish in life, it is education that makes the difference. This is a message that all of us must send out to young people across this country. Athletes are role models and as role models we have the unique opportunity to send that message. Being a role model is not something that we necessarily seek. It is not something that we necessarily want. But once you become one, you have the obligation to do what you can for those who follow. Some athletes should not be role models. Well, whether they should be or shouldn't be, the fact is that they are.

It is our opportunity to influence the future. Children are the future. Those with the ability to make a contribution to their futures must do so in positive ways. Our nation's children face many difficult and troubling problems: hunger, crime, disease, drugs, alcohol, homelessness, poverty, unemployment. All of those issues are difficult and sometimes they seem entrapable. But they also have one common bond. And that is that they can be impacted on in positive ways through education. Every one of those issues can be impacted in positive ways. We have to do what we can to make that difference.

The NCAA also has a role. The work that you do at the Convention will help us toward the goal of educating young people across this country. The education of today's student-athletes is crucial because they are tomorrow's leaders. They are tomorrow's role models. You people, those of you who are at this Convention, have worked hard the last few days and over the years to ensure that today's student-athletes are academically prepared for the future. You should be pleased with the work you have done.

There always is more to do. For example, we think about the resources that we pour into intercollegiate athletics. We give athletes as much time as necessary to prepare on the athletics field. We provide them with coaches. In the case of football, offensive and defensive coordinators, position coaches, trainers and team doctors who provide all of those resources in an area where most of these young men and women already have demonstrated great skill and ability.

It is time that we put more resources into our academic programs for our athletes. We need to provide them with more resources. You understand that need. The challenge is to get those who are not on board to understand that need.

	٠.	Honors	Dinner
--	----	--------	--------

You are part of a sports revolution. The message is going out that education is important. When student-athletes perform and achieve in the classroom, everybody wins. One of the lessons that I have learned over the years is that you can never have too many winners. Thank you:

(Applause)

Mr. Olsen: Thank you, Alan. Congratulations to you and your outstanding colleagues. Your success, particularly in the area of service.

to others, is an inspiration to all of us.

Now it is time for us to turn our attention to the focal point of each honors program—the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the Association bestows on an individual.

If you will open your program to Page 5, you will see photographs of past winners of this award, which recognizes a distinguished citizen who, having earned a varsity athletics award in college, has exemplified ideals and purposes to which college athletics programs and amateur sports competition are dedicated.

It is a distinguished group, including former presidents and the current president of the United States, military leaders, pioneers in space and medicine. All truly have been worthy of this recognition.

Today's honoree often receives his highest praise from voices that are seldom heard or quoted in the national media. He repeatedly and justifiably has received accolades for his proficiency as a professional football quarterback and for his effectiveness as a long-term member of the House of Representatives.

But the voices that praise him most are those who are affected by the problems that confront him on a daily basis as Secretary of Housing and

Urban Development.

Jack Kemp's successful record in Congress in actively protecting the rights of the disadvantaged, his commitment to issues concerning human rights and education, and his ability to gain consensus among decision-makers within various governmental and civil agencies, all placed him first on what had to be a very short list of individuals who could shoulder the responsibilities that confront America's foremost economic development and housing officer.

Mr. Kemp received unanimous confirmation from the United States Senate and was sworn into office by Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day

O'Connor.

Since assuming the leadership of the department, he has developed, introduced and secured the passage of major housing legislation that has created jobs and economic development, enforced fair housing for all people, empowered low-income families through resident management and urban homesteading, expanded affordable housing opportunities, combatted drugs in public housing, and aggressively attacked the problems presented by one of our nation's great tragedies—the homelessness in America.

Before his appointment to HUD, Jack Kemp represented the people of Buffalo, New York, for 18 years in the United States House of Representatives. He served on several committees, including House

Appropriations, Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, the Budget, Education and Labor, and Select Small Business. He also chaired the House Republican Conference for seven years. He served as a senior counselor to the President's National Bipartisan Commission on Central America, was an observer of the El Salvador elections, and was an active delegate to the Strategic Arms Limitations Treaty negotiations as well as the Jerusalem Conference on Terrorism.

**The secretary and his wife, Joanne, demonstrated their commitment to worldwide human rights through the founding of the Christian Rescue Effort for the Emancipation of Dissidents. As a commissioner on the Helsinki Commission on Human Rights, he fought for the rights of

Soviet Jews and political dissidents.

During his 13-year professional career, Jack set high standards for young quarterbacks like Bob Griese, who would follow him into professional football. He led Buffalo to league championships two consecutive seasons and earned all-pro honors twice. Jack also was selected the most valuable player in the American Football Conference. His jersey has been retired in the professional football hall of fame. One of his other accomplishments, for which I and others whom you have previously honored this evening are most grateful, was cofounding the AFL players association. He was elected president for five terms and helped negotiate one of the most comprehensive pension contracts in professional football history.

Jack earned little all-American honors at Occidental College, where he also set the school record for the javelin throw. The three-year starter and team captain was active in student government, a member of Alpha Tau Omega fraternity and provided swimming instructions to school children in south Pasadena during his spare time.

A recipient of the Gold Medal for Excellence in Leadership from the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame, Jack also is a lifetime member of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes and he also serves as vice-president of NFL Charities.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is with great pride that I present to you my

friend, Jack Kemp, from Occidental College. (Applause)

President Sweet: Secretary Kemp, recognizing your superb undergraduate career as a student and an athlete and your continuing commitment to the highest personal standards, this award is presented to you in recognition of your significant contributions as a guardian of human rights and dignity as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the United States and during your 18 years of service in this nation's House of Representatives. I am pleased to present this award to you. (Applause)

The Honorable Jack F. Kemp: Judy, thank you so very much for this beautiful award named after President Teddy Roosevelt. Merlin, thank you for your kind and generous remarks, particularly about my football career. I noticed that no one mentioned my grade-point

average.

77 '		athletes - Today's Top
Logit here tonight and	see these outstanding	atmetes— roday s rob
TO STO HOLD COMMENT WITH	DOC MICOC ORMANIANIS	

Honors Dinner	315
Honors Danie.	

Six all above 3.500 and Ty at a 4.000 grade-point average; and then to see many of the men with whom I shared National Football League and American Football League fields of friendly strife for so many years in the '50s, '60s and '70s—my mind goes back to a dinner in Washington, D.C., in 1960. A young senator from a party other than my own running for president by the name of John Kennedy got up and spoke at the Washington Touchdown Club.

I was a young quarterback in the American Football League. And I know, Merlin, you wouldn't mind if I mentioned one of my heroes and I know one of yours, hall of fame coach Sid Gillman of the Chargers. I happened to read in the Los Angeles Times or the San Diego Union or perhaps the New York Times on a Sunday after that dinner the remarks of this young man soon to be elected president. He chose as his words those of the distinguished president whose name graces this award—President Teddy Roosevelt.

About 82 years ago in September 1910 at the Sorbonne in Paris, Roosevelt said: "In life, the credit goes not to the critic who stands on the sideline and points out where the strong man stumbles. The real credit in the arena of life goes to the man whose face gets marred by sweat and dust and who with great enthusiasm and great devotion learns to spend himself in a worthy cause. Who at best if he wins, knows the thrill of high achievement, and if he fails, he at least fails while daring greatly. So that in life his place will never be with those very cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat."

I think I have finished every speech to every sports organization every since coach Gillman made me a quarterback for LA and the San Diego Chargers with that quote. When I told my wife that John Slaughter, the president of Occidental College, recently had called me to come to LA to receive this award, I thought that was enough of an honor.

A few years ago I heard my son, a graduate of Dartmouth, now a quarterback with the Philadelphia Eagles, give a speech. And he said at the end of his remarks that he couldn't finish his speech without listening in his mind to his father quoting John F. Kennedy quoting Teddy Roosevelt, which is about as original as his father ever got.

When I heard you, Merlin, talking about your son at Stanford and think about all of the sons and daughters who are recipients of these awards tonight, the greatest thrill will be to listen to your son or daughter stand up in front of an audience and say that you touched their lives many years ago.

I indeed am grateful for this award and particularly pleased that my pro football coach, Sid Gillman, could be here tonight as well as a great friend of the NCAA and I think the greatest commissioner in pro sports, Pete Rozelle, and his wife, Carrie. And if not the greatest quarterback, certainly the most courageus quarterback, Don Klosterman from Loyola Marymount University.

I want to thank you, the NCAA, for flying at great expense my college sweetheart all the way from Washington, D.C., to be here tonight. As Peter Rozelle introduced her the other night, she is the only wife and

emother of an NFL quarterback. You see, I wouldn't be where I am were it not for my family, many of whom are here tonight.

Dr. Slaughter, although you were not the president of Occidental when I went there, you and I have become fast friends. Judy, thank you for your leadership in these exciting and opportunistic moments in the history of the NCAA and college athletics.

🚰 I'd like to take the prerogatives of the rostrum as Alan and Janet did so well. I want to tell you a story about Payton Jordan, my first football coach at Occidental College. One day he called me in his sanctum sanctorum, his holy of holies. It was like the office of Frank Leahy, or Vince Lombardi, or any great coach. I was a young freshman football player struggling with school, struggling with football, struggling with my ambition, which was to be a pro football player. But I was afraid to tell anybody because I thought they would laugh. I was about 5-10 or 5-11, 180 pounds, going to Occidental College playing such mighty teams as Cal Tech and Claremont-Mudd-Scripps. I am teasing a little bit. Coach Jordan was my hero. Alan reminded us about our responsibilities to young people, both in academia as well as in coaching and in athletics. To make a long story short coach Jordan said: "Kemp, I have been watching you on the football field and frankly you just are not working hard enough. I know you can be a great football player. Don't tell anybody about this, but of all the members on this freshman football team, I believe you are the one that can go all the way and play pro football."

I can't tell you what that meant to me. Someone other than my mother actually believed I could play pro football. He said: "Listen, Kemp. I want you to work harder. I want you to put in more effort. I want you to not only try harder but I want you to study harder and make something of yourself, I know you can do it. Keep this to yourself, but some day I believe with all my heart that of all the players on the Occidental College team, you are the one guy who is in pro football range."

I would have run through a brick wall for that football coach. In fact, I did many times. I threw the football, threw the javelin, played baseball, lifted weights. I even studied.

I got drafted by the Detroit Lions; cut by the Detroit Lions. I got drafted by the Pittsburgh Steelers; cut by the Pittsburgh Steelers. I got drafted by the New York Giants; got cut by them. Those were the days when Pete Rozelle was not the commissioner. I went to the San Francisco 49ers and had a roommate, Tom Osborne, who went on to become one of the great coaches in the college ranks. Coach Gillman brought me to the Chargers.

We had a reunion of our football team a few years ago right before you came to Occidental, Dr. Slaughter. We were sitting around after the banquet one night and all the players were letting their hair down so to speak. We started talking about old times. I found out that every single football player at Occidental College had been told by coach Jordan if they worked hard and studied and they never quit and they were

tenacious and audacious, they could play pro football.

I told that story one time in a political context and a woman came up to me and said: "Jack, that is a great story for you, but how about all the: guys that never got to play football?" I tried to explain to her that every single football player that ever played for Jordan or any coach who you can think of inspires his athletes in that way and is a better man and indeed a better person for having had that coach, that teacher, that Rabbi, that priest, that mother, dad, whatever, touch their life in a very meaningful wav.

So tonight when I get the Theodore Roosevelt Award, I am going to thank God that I went to Occidental. I am going to thank God that I played professional football. And I thank God that I married the right's

woman. I thank God that I live in a country in which on a football field or in a gymnasium, or in a swimming pool, or on a basketball court, or a track, that there is no color, that there is no religion, there is no politics and there is no socioeconomic status. There is but one thing-courage, tenacity, never giving up on yourself or your team; never quitting and never finding yourselves with those cold and timid souls who never

have known victory because they never have known defeat. I thought as I quoted Theodore Roosevelt you might like to know how. he closed at the Sorbonne in Paris in 1910. We all have heard the words. I don't know that I got them exactly right. But I have used them as if they were right all these years. If they are not right, don't blame me. Blame John F. Kennedy's speech writers.

But here is how Teddy Roosevelt finished that speech in Paris in 1910. After using that wonderful quotation about the future belonging to the doers of deeds, he said in conclusion: "Very little use of the being whose timid soul knows nothing of the great and generous emotions, who knows nothing of the high pride, who knows nothing of the firm belief, who knows nothing of the lofty enthusiasm, knows nothing of the men and women who quell the storm and ride the thunder."

Dr. King's birthday is coming up soon. He reminded us in his memorable way that some day there will come a time in which our children will be judged not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. By the ability to quell the storm and ride the thunder because this world needs men and women who do deeds.

To all of you, to all the doers of deeds up here and out there, the future of America—indeed, I would say the future of the world—depends on you. God bless you, God bless America. Thank you very much. (Applause)

President Sweet: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Now I am pleased to present to John Brooks Slaughter, president of Occidental College, a plaque commemorating this day honoring one of its most outstanding alumni. President Slaughter, congratulations. (Applause)

Mr. Olsen: It is interesting that we never know when we are going to be blind-sided. Back in 1958 as a freshman at Utah State, I got a phone call from Payton Jordan. We do listen to our coaches and I think

______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

wou have heard this message tonight.

This has been a most enjoyable evening for me. I am pleased that I had the opportunity to participate in it and to be a part of it. I would like to ask this wonderful group of honorees to stand and let us give them one more big round of applause. Will you do that please. (Applause)

I also would salute you, the members of this Association, for taking time from your busy schedules to recognize these individuals who truly

Feptomize the values of intercollegiate athletics.

I'll give you one quick story to end my part of this program. It goes back to a time we talked about when we introduced Bob Griese, the 寒 1972 Miami Dolphin team. I had been sent to interview coach Schula and spent a couple of days with him and talked about that great season. He had talked about all of the planning, preparation, dedication, commitment and execution. We were surrounded by these wonderful trophies and plaques that had celebrated that incredible season of

At the end of this very long day of shooting I said: "Coach, we have talked about all the positives, all the very positive things that have happened. Are there any negatives that have come out of this, anything Ithat really worries you?"

He stopped a minute and looked at me. He said: "Merlin, you know there is one thing that really frightens me. I am afraid that we might forget how hard we have worked to get where we are today. I am afraid of complacency."

I would like to have those words tattooed somewhere on the back of my brain because I don't think any of us can afford to forget how hard we have worked to get to where we are today and how hard we must work to get to where we want to be tomorrow.

I thank you for allowing me to be a part of this program. (Applause) President Sweet: Merlin, in my opening remarks I mentioned that the honors dinner is a very special event. You have made it extra special by being a part of it. We sincerely appreciate your sharing your time with us and thank you for the outstanding job you have done in paying tribute to these outstanding individuals.

As a token of our appreciation for your serving so ably as the master of ceremonies tonight and to remind you of the admiration and respect our Association holds for you, I am pleased to present to you this gift of crystal that goes very well with flowers. (Applause)

And now, if the audience will please rise we will be dismissed after Martha Hawthorne presents the benediction.

Ms. Hawthorne: Let us pray together. Dear Father, thank you for this special time together. As we depart, let us go with the peace of knowing that your love is ever present to protect, lead and govern us in all that we do. Amen.

. 1	1.			
۰	9	Honoi s	Dinner	
- 4	72,	HUNDIS	L'Elmic.	

General Business Session

Thursday Afternoon, January 9, 1992

The general business session was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with President Judith M. Sweet presiding.

President Sweet: Will the delegates please take their seats. I would like to call the general session to order. The 1992 general session is now in order.

[NOTE: Motions were made, seconded and approved to accept the reports of the sports and standing committees, treasurer, Council, Executive Committee and Presidents Commission.]

SUPPLEMENT TO MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Laurie Priest (Mount Holyoke College): President Sweet and delegates, in addition to those individuals recognized on Tuesday, please add the following:

Eugene Bertog, Loyola University (Illinois)
Howard Dallmar, Stanford University
Terry Flanagan, Bowling Green State University
Eugene Flynn, College of the Holy Cross
Glen Frazier, Ohio Wesleyan University
Robert Hamilton, DePaul University
Keith Jordan, Wittenberg University
William J. Mack, Morehead State University
Brendon McNamara, University of Detroit Mercy
Dr. Roger Nagler, St. Francis College (New York)
Edward J. Smyke, Emory University
James Younge, North Carolina Central University

Please stand and observe a moment of silence for those who have gone before us.

OPENING REMARKS

President Sweet: As we begin the voting on the remaining legislation before this Convention, let me report to you that all of the voting actions during the business sessions will appear in next week's issue of The NCAA News dated January 15. So in that issue, you will have a record of all the votes taken at this Convention. This will be an expanded record including the proposal number, intent, the voting action and any pertinent interpretations. We are distributing in this room this afternoon a listing of all the voting actions taken yesterday and today by the respective divisions and subdivisions.

320 ______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

Those actions stand unless they are reconsidered or rescinded in this session. If you intend to reconsider such an action, that can only occur in the window of reconsideration that will be announced immediately after action on the consent package. As for attempts by the Convention to rescind a division action, when we come to each of those actions in their numerical sequence, I will call your attention briefly to the division's vote. If anyone intends to rescind any such action, that is the time to rise and do so.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

"[NOTE: The results of votes taken in the division business sessions were reported as the proposals appeared in the Convention Program and are not reprinted here unless additional action was taken. The results also appear in the proceedings of each business session and in Appendix A.]

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): Madam Chair, I move to consider Proposal No. 154, appearing in the buff-colored supplement immediately prior to Proposal No. 109 rather than at the very end of this general session.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Consent Package

Susan A. Collins (George Mason University): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal Nos. 1 through 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal Nos. 1 through 13 (Page A-2) were approved as a consent package.]

RECONSIDERATION OF DIVISION VOTING ACTION

Reconsideration of Restricted-Earnings Coaches—Division I-AA (54)

Charles E. Clark (East Tennessee State University): Having voted with the prevailing side on Proposal No. 54 in Division I-AA, I move for its reconsideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

David B. Wagner (Georgia Southern University): I apologize to my fellow members of Division I-AA for not explaining this more clearly yesterday morning. There have been some misperceptions arise. The first misperception of the intent of this legislation is that by increasing the number of restricted-earnings coaches, while staying within the total salary limits of \$24,000, we would increase miscellaneous costs. I cannot refute that. There will be some miscellaneous costs involved. But we do not deal with the restricted-earnings coach. This was a condition placed upon us by Division I-A, which had a problem restricting the earnings of coaches.

We have used graduate assistants and volunteers and part-time people, many of whom we pay very little. It has never been a factor of us paying someone too much. This legislation removes our opportunity to have a volunteer. Each of us has a special person, in our case it is an English professor who is retired, who coaches our kickers and comes in

	37	1
meral Rusiness Session		į

as a father confessor for the players. We are going to have to eliminate him from our program. It is not a matter of money, it is a matter of

Secondly, there is some consideration that we do have an unlimited numbers. number of coaches. Mathematically, the term "unlimited" is hard for some to deal with. We have a very diverse membership in I-AA, and we want to have as much flexibility as possible in this legislation. We, in the Southern Conference, would strongly support limiting that number to four in future years. I would wish to have you reconsider this and vote in favor of this legislation.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 54 (Page A-84) was defeated, 46-47.]

Reconsideration of Maximum Awards—Division II (64)

Frank Cignetti (Indiana University of Pennsylvania): Madam President, having voted on the prevailing side, I wish to move Proposal No. 64 for reconsideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

Harold J. McGee (Jacksonville State University): We would like to recommend reconsideration of Proposal No. 64 on the basis of it being a recommendation to revise three separate bylaws Under Part A, change football; under Part B, change men's and women's basketball, and under Part C, change all of the men's and women's sports. We think that since it involves three distinct and separate issues it would be in order to vote on A, B and C separately. We would be in favor of reconsideration.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): I would like to speak in opposition to reconsideration. Division II considered the package as a whole. There was an opportunity to divide during the discussion and the division was not asked to do so. The vote was 116 in favor of the reduction of the scholarships, 74 against and one abstention. I don't believe that we need to get into breaking out each and every individual sport in the whole package. Division II acted responsibly.

It wasn't requested by the Presidents Commission, but Division IIwent ahead and further reduced scholarships as a cost-savings measure. I request and hope that everyone in Division II will continue as to vote in favor of this motion instead of trying to break out each and? every one of the sports and take the rest of the afternoon.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 64 (Page A-91) was

defeated by Division II.]

Reconsideration of Outside Competition (46)

Pamela L. Gill-Fisher (University of California, Davis): Madamie Chair, I move to reconsider Proposal No. 46 in Division II only.

[The motion was seconded.]

Joseph T. Donahue (California State University, Stanislaus): Madam Chair, Proposals 45 and 46, both referring to outside competition for Division II athletes, were narrowly defeated. They are very controversial issues in our division; and upon much consideration, people feel very strongly that this should be reconsidered. There is a

problem with No. 46 in Part B about monitoring the competition. That is the only thing that seems to be holding people back in passing No. 46 in Division II. With further discussion, we think that can be alleviated and No. 46 can be approved in Division II.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 46 (Page A-75) was defeated by Division II.)

Reconsideration of Football Evaluations (134)

Douglas B. Fullerton (Montana State University): Having voted on the prevailing side, I would like to move to reconsider No. 134 for Division I-AA, as amended.

[The motion was seconded.]

Just very, very briefly, the legislation doesn't make sense in that recruiting of football is a process that begins with the spring recruiting with the juniors and ends sometime after the signing date. To line up the number of evaluations and the recruiting process to coincide makes sense. Division I-A saw it made sense and passed it. Division I-AA did onot. This would put I-AA in line with Division I-A. Thank you.

The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 134 (Page A-162) was approved by Division I-AA.]

[Proposal No. 134 (Page A-162) was approved by Division I-AA, as amended by No. 134-1.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Resolution: Academic Requirements

Laurence C. Keating Jr. (Seton Hall University): I move Proposal No. 27.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Sweet: It has been seconded. On the advice of the Parliamentarian, I have been advised that this proposal is out of order. Mr. Keating: May I ask the reasons for it being out of order?

President Sweet: The resolution offered in Proposal No. 27 is considered to be out of order for a number of reasons relating to the wording of the last paragraph, beginning with the "Be It Further Resolved." In this paragraph, the resolution requires "that each amendment offered at future Conventions as a result of the committee's recommendations based on the NCAA Academic Performance Study be presented to the delegates of the Convention with research data that supports the amendment or the amendment must be withdrawn."

t The above wording places conditions on what amendments may be offered at future Conventions without placing such conditions in the NCAA constitution or bylaws. A basic principle of parliamentary procedure is stated on Page 88 of Robert's Rules of Order, 1990 Edition, regarding the freedom of each new session. It has to be in the bylaws. It is not part of our bylaws to bind future Conventions.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): Would I be correct in interpreting what you just said that if we had crossed off the part that the amendment must be withdrawn, this would have been in order? President Sweet: I have been advised by the parliamentarian that

_	323
General Business Session	 223

Coaches' Athletically Related Income

R. Gerald Turner (University of Mississippi): Madam Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 28 on behalf of the Presidents Commission:

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal addresses concerns of the Presidents Commission about possible conflicts of interest involving the sources and amounts of athletically related income received by a coach. A special committee made up of CEOs, ADs and coaches reviewed coaches' compensationissues and reported to the Presidents Commission. The Commission, believes this proposal provides a significant step in maintaining its. institutional control over the coaches that a university or college employs. The legislation requires prior written approval by the institution's chief executive officer of all of the athletically related income and benefits from sources outside the institution that have been the subject of the annual reporting requirement under Bylaw 11.2.2 for a the past several years. Please note that among the interpretations, provided here at the Convention is one related to this proposal. The Council, in responding to concerns expressed by many athletics administrators, has determined that it is permissible for an institution's chief executive officer to grant general prior written approval for a coach to receive income that does not exceed an institutionally determined nominal amount, not in excess of \$500 for each occurrence from speaking engagements and camps or clinics participation.

A detailed accounting of all such income shall be provided annually by the coach to the chief executive officer. It should be noted that the proposal does not limit the income that a coach may receive, it merely places the chief executive in a position to know of and approve in advance all athletically related income. The football and basketball coaches who served on the Commission's special committee believe that this is a workable approach to this important concern. I urge your support of Proposal No. 28.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): Madam Chair, Chancellor Turner has given an excellent explanation of the proposal. I think it needs no elaboration. I would simply urge my colleagues in Division II to support the Presidents Commission and vote for Proposal No. 28.

[Proposal No. 28, Part A (Page A-32) was approved by Division I, 296-23, three abstentions, and Division II, 146-43, one abstention, roll-call votes. Part B was approved by all divisions, 299-19, four abstentions, Division I; 152-33, Division II; 222-12, one abstention, Division III, roll-call votes]

Division I-AAA Football

R. Elaine Dreidame (University of Dayton): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the NCAA Presidents Commission, I move Proposal No.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposed Amendments A, B, C and D will establish a Division I-AAA football classification by specifying the eligibility to be classified in

1992 Convention Proceedings

I-AAA football will be open to all NCAA member institutions that were classified as Division I member institutions as of September 1, 1991. It will stipulate that the voting on Division I-AAA football issues will take place during the annual Division I-AAA business session and specifies that Divisions I-A and I-AA will have rescission rights over I-AAA football but that Division I-AAA will not have rescission rights over Division I-A or Division I-AA football legislation.

²As we review Proposal No. 34, it is important to remind ourselves of the significant reform measures that were passed at the 1991 NCAA Convention and of the many factors that made this reform a reality. Cost-containment, restructuring, Division I-A voting autonomy and the elimination of multidivision classifications were made possible through the division of a number of NCAA constituencies. Most important to this reform package was the ability of the NCAA leadership to develop good faith and trust among a number of important NCAA constituencies. Thus, the importance of following through on sissues remaining from the 1991 legislative agenda should not be

underestimated.

This Division I-AAA football legislation will provide a classification for Division I nonscholarship football programs that will be displaced as a result of the elimination of multidivision classification and will complete that 1991 reform package. This legislative concept significantly assisted Division III and was important to the give-and-take process that resulted in a number of legislative victories at the 1991 Convention. We must remember that the Division I-AAA football, as proposed, is cost-containment legislation, and the universities that supported the elimination of multidivision classifications even though it eliminated them from NCAA championship competition were depending upon the good faith and trust of colleagues with regard to the support of the Division I-AAA football legislation before you today.

The 13-member Division I-AAA football subcommittee commenced its charge by surveying the Division I members currently using multidivision classification and determined that a great majority were using Division III rules and desired that Division I-AAA football be designed to mirror the Division III philosophy of intercollegiate competition. Only those institutions located in the West that were playing in Division II maintained a desire for the I-AAA football classification to be a scaled down version of I-AA with five to 10 fullscholarship equivalencies. The subcommittee determined that those institutions that desire to give any type of athletics scholarships, even if they were based upon need as currently is the practice in the Patriot League, should work within the framework of Division I-AA.

It was the subcommittee's opinion philosophically that those institutions had more in common with Division I-ÂA than with the proposed I-AAA. Therefore, I-AAA was designed to be operated as a costcontainment option with maximum annual institutional expenditures of approximately \$225,000. The subcommittee spent one year developing Proposal No. 34 and made a special effort to be sensitive to the concerns

	3:	4
eral Business Session		

expressed by all segments of the membership and by the Council and the Presidents Commission. The final package controls or eliminates the vast majority of concerns expressed by Divisions I-AA and II; and after thorough review, both the NCAA Council and the NCAA Presidents Commission have co-sponsored the I-AAA football legislation contained

in Proposal No. 34.

Division I has historically recognized the uniqueness of the sport of football, and the Division I philosophy statement actually states that members of Division I recognize the differences in institutional objectives in support of football. Division I currently permits I-A: sponsorship, I-AA sponsorship and multidivision classification in Divisions II and III, or no sponsorship at all. Passage of this legislation will provide the continuation of the opportunity for Division I institutions to conduct a football program at the financial level that best fits the goals and aspirations of their institutions and athletics programs. Division I-AAA football is not a new concept, it is simply a new name for football formally known as multidivision classification, a Division III

On behalf of the subcommittee, the NCAA Council and the Presidents

Commission. I urge your support of this proposal.

Sheldon Hackney (University of Pennsylvania): Madam Chair, 1 rise to express on behalf of the Presidents Commission its wishes that the Convention might pass this. The previous speaker has explained very lucidly the need for this legislation, and let me simply say that I ams quite aware that there are differences of opinion on this, especially in a Division I-AA and in Division II. Some of my best friends are on the other side of this issue. I believe it is one that is good for the NCAA in general. It is the last of the restructuring measures. The number of votes that were cast last year on earlier parts of the restructuring proposals were cast on the assurance that this legislation would be say developed and would come forward and would be supported by the divisions. So, I think there is an element of good faith that needs to be shown here.

Secondly, I would like to reiterate the matter of fairness. There are number of institutions in Division I that wish to play football but wishto play football at a less expensive level than Division I-A or I-AAsils think it would be good of the organization to provide a way for those, institutions to do that. So, in a spirit of accommodation I urge this

Convention to support this legislation.

326.

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): Madam Chair, I am a member of * the Division III Steering Committee and chair of that committee. stand today to speak in favor of Proposal No. 34. During the 1991 Convention, the membership eliminated the opportunity for Division I^r football-playing institutions to play football in Division III. It was at the request of the Division III members who felt it was not advisable to compete against athletics programs that only had one sponsorship and, that multidivision classification was eliminated. The Division III membership supports a Division I-AAA football concept.

Also, the Division III membership supports the establishment of a Division I-AAA football classification that mirrors the rules in Division III. The I-AAA football institutions that are spread throughout the West and Midwest will need to continue to play Division III institutions in order to complete their 10-game schedules without being forced into expensive or extensive travel. It is important to the Division III institutions that will play I-AAA institutions that this classification Fretain a philosophy and commitment similar to the Division III philosophy and that I-AAA rules and regulations also be under the same NCAA umbrella as the Division III members. On behalf of the Division III membership, I urge your support of this proposal.

William L. Price (Norfolk State University): I am athletics director of Norfolk State University, Norfolk, Virginia, I speak against this proposal because, in fact, I-AAA will be recruiting the same type of athletes that we recruit in Division II. Secondly, we already have in splace a mechanism for Division I-AAA. They can chose I-AA where scholarships are awarded. I also have a question about a two-way philosophy in that you will have athletes who are Division I in all other Sports, and then in football it will be Division II or Division III. I think that is a problem. Thirdly, how can we determine once an athlete is recruited in another sport that that athlete will be restricted to that sport only and not play football? I have a great concern about it. With this, next they will move up so there will be no Division II. I plead to you and ask for your support in defeat of this.

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): Madam President, I am vice-president of the Division II Steering Committee and I rise to speak in support of Proposal No. 34. In behalf of the steering committee, I would like to remind my colleagues in Division II that the steering committee was invited to work collaboratively with the Council subcommittee looking at the I-AAA issue. In fact, the Division II Steering Committee polled the Division II membership, asking it for input regarding proposals associated with I-AAA. Many of those suggestions and recommendations were positively embraced by the subcommittee; and in good conscience. I would like to ask our Division II colleagues to seriously consider supporting the FAAA option this afternoon.

David G. Carter (Eastern Connecticut State University): Madam Chair, I stand before you to urge this body to support the resolution concerning I-AAA football. I believe that the rationale has been adequately discussed. I believe the commitment has been made and I think it would be in order for this body to support the resolution.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): Madam Chair, I would urge that the delegation oppose Proposal No. 34 for the same reasons stated by my colleague from Norfolk State University. This would involve at least for some Division I-AA campuses a decimation of the ranks for the reasons defined by Norfolk, Secondly. for some it is perceived as a playing of games, and thirdly, it is just plain bad legislation. I would urge a "no" vote.

John W. Moore (California State University, Stanislaus): Madam President, I am a member of the Presidents Commission representing Division II. I stand to urge the Convention to support Proposal No. 34 and particularly to appeal to the members of Division II to support the resolution. The reasons have been clearly stated, and there is a good faith obligation that we need to meet. I should add, however, that within Division II there is a concern for Bylaw C. I have been informed by the leadership of the Presidents Commission that Bylaw C will be reconsidered and brought before the Convention next year. I urge passage of No. 34.

Richard H. Perry (University of California, Riverside): I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 34. If I may have editorial license to insert a very strong exception to Item C, regarding Bylaw 20.4.1.1. Within this legislation, which permanently disenfranchises Division II members who might move into Division I after September 1, 1991, from participating in Division I-AAA football. It boggles the mind to actually see in print the rationale statement for legislation that states, "This proposal will ensure that institutions classified in Divisions II or III on September 1, 1991, will be unable to move their athletics programs to Division I for the purpose of participating in the sharing of Division I basketball funds while operating a low-cost football program."

What an incredible assumption, and even more, what an incredible action. I would submit that this is tantamount to saying that the great American dream ensures that regardless of however humble our birthright we can be elected President of the United States. However, if you are elected after the age of 45, you can still be elected President but you can't live in the White House. I find it more than just a bit interesting that eight of the 10 Division I institutions on the West Coast will be looking for football alternatives that might conceivably end up being I-AAA with all members of our Division II collegiate conference. The CCAA, within the last 20 years won two cases within the last year. Each of these emerging institutions has had the opportunity and the foresight to move their athletics programs in concert with the growth of their institutions in terms of size, scope of academic offerings and spirit of geographical influence.

This legislation would deny that option to emerging institutions. All of this notwithstanding, I have been convinced over the last two days by my colleagues in Division I institutions that this is an important and necessary piece of legislation; and with the help of college football generally and Division I specifically, our institution is prepared to put our trust in the wisdom and fairness of the Council and our Division II Steering Committee to review that portion of this legislation that we find most offensive and discriminatory. We are in support of an otherwise good piece of legislation. In keeping with the historical tradition of mutual give and take among divisions, we would urge our Division II colleagues to join us in voting for the Division I-AAA football concept and then work collectively toward the resolution of any inequities otherwise contained in this legislation.

1992 Convention Proceedings

Benny Hollis (Northeast Louisiana University): I am a member of the Division I-AA Football Committee. I speak today on behalf of the entire I-AA football committee. Fellow delegates, we have seen this issue before. It is nothing new. We are very much opposed to Proposal No. 34 entitled I-AAA football. We believe this is poor legislation for the following reasons.

First, it is in direct contradiction of the policy and philosophy statement of Division I. We had a special committee last year, and I believe Gene Corrigan chaired it, and we restructured Division I. We talked about a significant commitment that you make to play Division I football. You call it what you want. This is nothing but an attempt to play Division III football and count it as a Division I sport.

Second, the creation of I-AAA football is unnecessary. The standards set in Division I-AA are maximum. They are not minimum. You can have three coaches, you can have need-based aid if you desire, but there is no reason to add another division. There is already enough confusion about I-A and I-AA.

Third, I sincerely believe that this legislation will cause some flight from I-AA to I-AAA and it will seriously damage the I-AA championship. During the last six years as a member of the I-AA football committee, we have worked long and hard to establish a live, viable championship, one that is successful not only with the interest but also with financial support. We believe we have done that. We have created a game in which there is a great deal of national interest and it is on national television. We have had good crowds. Now, we have this disturbance in Division I-AA. Division I-AA is the division that is going to be most directly impacted by this decision. We believe that everything is in place and it is entirely unnecessary to vote on this legislation, and it is in contradiction of what we should be doing in Division I. I urge you to yote "no" and defeat this legislation.

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): I am a Division I-AA member of the Council subcommittee on I-AAA football. A number of I-AA institutions are apprehensive about the effect that will occur on I-AA football if this is adopted, what effect the adoption would have on the current size of the I-AA subdivision and about the future of the I-AA championship beyond the five-year period, which has been guaranteed by the current legislation.

Contrasting these concerns is the responsibility placed among the membership by this good-faith and trust argument that played a part in eliminating multidivision classification last year. I might remind the membership that prior to elimination of multidivision classification we did have Division I institutions playing nonscholarship football.

I submit that a similar good-faith position with respect to the future of I-AA football may help to allay some of the concerns of the I-AA subdivision. We have heard that football is a unique sport, a sport in which there are many competitors. Because of this, I believe that the membership would be willing to vote to pass legislation allowing retention of the I-AA subdivision even if the membership numbers fall

General Business Session

below those required in Bylaw 18.2.3. One does not know at this time how much attrition there would be in I-AA. But assuming, for instance, that the membership in I-AA fell to one-half of its current size, there would still be 45 members to participate in the I-AA subdivision.

This would represent at a minimum approximately 2,700 student-athletes. It does not seem feasible that we would eliminate a subdivision or a championship representing this number of student-athletes when there are other NCAA championships in force that have only a total of about 20 percent of the student-athlete population.

So by fulfilling our good-faith and trust responsibilities to those who currently need a I-AAA subdivision, we in I-AA could expect the same good faith and trust in the future. I urge your support for this

proposition.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I wish to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 34, which is, in my opinion, bad legislation that runs counter to previously approved legislation ending dual division classification for an institution. Proposal No. 34 will cause significant problems if it should be approved. Point one, if this legislation is good legislation, why is it limited only to member institutions that were classified in Division I as of September 1 of last year? In the future, if a Division II school wished to move up to Division I, why should this classification be denied? The gentleman in front made the same point a moment ago.

Point two, if a minimum of 50 percent of all contests must be against bivision I teams, it follows that 50 percent may be against teams outside Division I. This hardly seems to fit into the spirit of previously passed NCAA legislation that intended to prevent dual or multiple-division classification. Isn't this really non-Division I football to which we have attached the misleading label to make it seem as if it is

somehow with Division I football?

Point three, in the past we have often heard expressions of concern about graduate assistant coaches, part-time coaches, restricted-earnings coaches, whatever you want to call them, recruiting off campus when they likely are not well-qualified to do so because of their lack of knowledge of NCAA rules. Yet, this proposal suggests that seven Division I-AAA football coaches may engage in recruiting at a particular institution even though only three, one head coach and two assistants are full-time coaches. This is an open invitation for repeated violation of NCAA Division I recruitment regulations, even if not intentional. I wonder how much rigor there is in the legislative statement that each institution shall certify the seven individuals that recruit.

Point four, a Division I-AAA school will have to offer athletics scholarships to numerous other students in numerous other sports. How will football players at a Division I-AAA school feel when they learn that because of the particular sport in which they have chosen to compete athletics aid is by definition unavailable to them while athletes in all other sports can receive athletically related financial aid? I believe that the implications of this second-class citizenship

being placed on I-AAA football players has not been explored thoroughly enough. I don't believe that the problem would be as severe if we were up front with students and simply called this Division III football.

My last point, point five, this legislation sends a very mixed message to the public. In the past we have said that we were serious about maintaining high standards regarding the financial commitment to athletics in all Division I schools, especially in regard to the number of athletically related scholarships we offer. Now, in Proposal No. 34, we are telling the public that we really didn't mean what we said since we are willing to allow a large number of student-athletes in a major sport to be prohibited from receiving athletically related financial aid even while we continue to call it a Division I sport.

· If this legislation passes, don't be surprised if the public sees the NCAA to be confused and/or devious. For these reasons and for others

I will not mention, I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 34.

Hoke L. Smith (Towson State University): I rise to speak on behalf of Proposal No. 34. This legislation is very complex and the time frame before the reform takes place is very short. It is possible to nibble it to death with fears, anxieties and doubts. I think the issue is very simple. I have heard a great deal about the student-athletes since I have been coming to the NCAA. Is this Convention going to vote to expand or contract the opportunity for student-athletes to play football? We are now a Division I-AA school. We have lost about 20 percent of our state funding. We will be raising tuitions. We cannot raise our fees for an athletics program with 22 sports differing by fees much more. There are two ways we can become a I-AAA school.

One is if this legislation passes, the other is by dropping football. I think that we are not unique in that. In addition, there are many current I-AAA schools that would wish to adopt football but will be unable to unless this legislation passes. It has been mentioned that it is possible for us to play I-AAA rules within the framework of I-AA. This is true and pragmatically we may do it. But I have serious reservations about this Association in the middle of a reform movement consciously adopting policies that encourage each institution and each conference to make its own rules rather than to come up where a common set of rules would govern intercollegiate athletics.

So, for purposes of expanding football rather than contracting it or providing opportunity for student-athletes and ensuring that we will, as much as possible, abide by the same rules within each division, I

urge you to vote to adopt this proposal.

Robert C. Deming (Ithaca College): Madam President, I have somewhat of a unique perspective. As chair of the Division III Football Committee, I urge your support on Proposal No. 34. As the director of athletics at Ithaca College, one of the perpetrators of legislation to restrict Division III championships to Division III institutions, this legislation was the result of the 1980 Stagg Bowl that included Dayton.

On a personal perspective, based on my experience in 1970 as the head coach of the State University of New York at Buffalo, a very

General Business Session _____

competitive Division I football program was dropped only to come backseven years later at the Division III level. The main reason the program was dropped was the inability to fund four years of athletics scholar, ships. Those of you in I-AA have a right and legitimate concern. Division I-AAA will become a viable option for the institutions that have no problem funding scholarship financial aid, particularly grants.

Yesterday, we were told that 70 percent of the Division I programs will be in the red this year. Water seeks its own level and so will football. There is no panacea in Division I-A or I-AA football for institutions that feel the need to provide prospective students a football opportunity, which has a reasonable chance for success.

As president of the ECAC, I can tell you we have made provision to accommodate our Division I and Division II institutions. But for those, others, please have confidence in this organization to accommodate. I-AAA and accept the inevitable. Some current programs will be impacted, but at least they will have a place to go.

James V. Koch (Old Dominion University): Madam Chair, I want to voice strong support for No. 34. Division I-AAA football represents a sane and rational approach to intercollegiate athletics. I believe that it also represents the future. Colleagues, I am confident that many institutions in the NCAA will be playing I-AAA football or whatever we choose to call it 10 years from now. The time will come, if not this year, certainly at some time in the immediate future.

I believe that I-AAA football also provides us with a fruitful model for future structural development in the entire NCAA. I have heard some critics of I-AAA football argue that if you want to be in Division I you should be willing to make the financial commitment to do so. In fact, many of the institutions that might opt for Division I-AAA already are making a very healthy Division I commitment. To use my own institution, Old Dominion University, as an example, we sponsor 16 sports and spend some \$5 million on those sports each year. That commitment has been considerable enough that we have won an average of one national championship a year since 1975. We are making a Division I commitment and Division I-AAA football, if we would choose to do it, would be a commitment in addition.

It is ironic, I think, as well that I have heard some institutions talk about a possible change of institution from I-AA to I-AAA as being bad. The idea that saving money and saving time demands on athletes is dangerous or evil. If that is so, then we have been wasting our time in the Presidents Commission and inside these meetings for the last several years. Colleagues, I urge passage. This is an idea whose time

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference): If No. 34 passes, this Association will have shown its willingness to go to great lengths to accommodate the football preferences of a small number of institutions. It is reassuring to hear one of my Council colleagues give assurances that accommodations will be enforced for I-AA scholarship football programs should their attrition be realized over time. However,

Division I institutions that wish to retain or add nonscholarship football programs, can be readily accommodated within Division I-AA. The Ivy Group, the Patriot League, the ECAC and the West Coast demonstrate this clearly. The NCAA does not need to create an entirely new division to accommodate Division I non-scholarship low-cost football. If Proposal No. 34 does not pass, these programs can and will be welcomed within Division I-AA and will be well served in the process.

James Frank (Southwestern Athletic Conference): In addition to agreeing with the speakers that are opposed to this legislation, I would just like to make one additional point. The only opportunity realistically aunavailable to these and other similarly displaced programs is the chance to compete for an NCAA national championship, an opportunity that is not included in the proposed legislation and that its supporters have repeatedly said they do not wish to have. That point has not been made previously. I urge that this legislation be defeated.

James Jarrett (Old Dominion University): The current I-AA classification does not meet the needs of Division I institutions that have been eliminated from Division III football. Seven full-time coaches, broad recruiting programs, spring practice and athletics scholarships are not cost-containment programs. The institutions that need the I-AAA classification are spread throughout the nation and will need to play portions of their schedule against Division III institutions in order to control travel costs. It is, therefore, imperative that the playing field between these institutions remain level. Thus, a separate I-AAA, with financial aid regulations enforceable by the NCAA, is necessary in order to accomplish the level playing field. I urge your support of this legislation.

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): Madam Chair, my comments will be very brief as they were last year. At that time I rose to support what was then Proposal 53, which has brought us to today. What I said last year, I believe, pertains this year. The Presidents Commission supports this resolution. The NCAA Steering Committees support this resolution. The poll of the presidents in the NCAA supports this resolution and the Old Testament prophets still support this resolution. The problem remains the same. It is a question of justice and equity. We will create a new dimension of homelessness in America if we don't give them Division I-AAA. I urge its support.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): I would like to speak to my 189 colleagues in Division II and urge that they imitate the good example set by the athletics director at the University of California, Riverside, who said although he has concerns with portions of this proposal he is willing, in the spirit of cooperation, to pass it. I would like to remind the members of Division II that in 1982 in Houston, Texas, Divisions II and III got rid of the albatross of the five-year rule. We only got rid of the five-year rule in Divisions II and III, folks, because of the cooperation of the Division I members who voted for us so we could get rid of this, even though they had no interest at the time. So they

supported us and gave us freedom from that rule. So, I would like to urge my colleagues in Division II to remember that and vote in the spirit of cooperation here rather than in an adversarial spirit. So, I urger my colleagues in Division II to give Division I the same kind of fair treatment they gave us in 1982 and vote "yes" on this proposal.

[Proposal No. 34, Parts A through D (Page A-44) was defeated? required approval by all three Divisions, 166-143, six abstentions, Division I; 68-107, 12 abstentions, Division II; 218-10, six abstentions, Division III, roll-call votes. Parts E through T were moot due to defeat of Parts A through D.]

Resolution: Presidential Authority and Institutional Responsibility

R. Gerald Turner (University of Mississippi): I move adoption of Proposal No. 35.

[The motion was seconded.]

The work of the Presidents Commission's subcommittee on strategic planning has been well publicized. Our recommendations of topics for the Commission's primary attention in the next three years has been published in The NCAA News and mailed to the chief executive officers of member institutions. This resolution identifies the first of the three greats of emphasis in that report. Specifically, we want to focus in the next year on the areas of presidential authority and institutional control.

What this resolution says is that we will conduct a study of various elements involved in those encompassing areas and we will consult with the Council and others in the membership in doing so. We will look at certification and at the role and structure of the Presidents Commission itself and the ways of strengthening the role of the CEOs at the institutional and conference levels, and we will submit legislation for next year's Convention to deal with those matters.

We have already appointed two Commission subcommittees to work in those areas. Two members have been appointed to serve in a liaison role with the Council subcommittee that is working on certification and on ways of simplifying the legislative process. In short, this effort is well under way. It is most important and we urge your adoption of this resolution to put the membership squarely on record as supporting this study. I urge approval of Proposal No. 35.

[Proposal No. 35 (Page A-59) was approved, 717-8, one absteration, roll-call vote.]

Resolution: Financial Issues

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): I move Proposal No. 36.

[The motion was seconded.]

Chancellor Turner just gave you the background of the two Commission-sponsored resolutions that are before this Convention. No. 35 identifies the first topic in our current three-year program of work. Proposal No. 36 identifies the second topic, the wide-range matter of financial issues. This resolution, like No. 35, directs the Commission to

study this topic consulting with the Council and others in so doing.

In this case, a Commission subcommittee will be appointed in the near future to take responsibility for conducting the study. That subcommittee will finish its work by June 1993 so that legislation can be before this Convention in January 1994. As identified in the resolution, the Commission will be looking at a wide range of fiscal matters—further cost-containment reduction; the general financial condition of college athletics, which, as we all know, is not good at this point; the matter of financial integrity as a key factor in the reform of college athletics, as well as the matter of financial aid for student-wathletes, among other topics.

We believe this study is a logical and much needed next step in our activities and we would appreciate your strong expression of endorsement for this study Thank you very much.

[Proposal No. 36 (Page A-59) was approved, 747-5, two abstentions,

roll-call vote.]

[The general business session recessed for 15 minutes.]

Practice Eligibility

Lorna P. Straus (University of Chicago): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 37.

[The motion was seconded.]

As indicated in the rationale statement for Proposal No. 37, currently a student-athlete is required to be enrolled in a degree program of studies in order to be eligible for competition but not for practice. The NCAA Academic Requirements Committee does not believe that this inconsistency makes sense or is justified. Therefore, I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 37, which would require a student-athlete to be enrolled in a degree program in order to be eligible for practice.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): Just a point of clarification. This language reads "enrolled to be eligible for practice." That does not interfere with the current legislation that allows practice August 15, 16, 17 for fall sports prior to enrollment, does it?

President Sweet: That is correct.

[Proposal No. 37 (Page A-60) was approved.]

Drug-Testing Consent Form

Malcolm C. McInnis Jr. (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move the adoption of Proposal No. 41-1.

The motion was seconded.

This amendment-to-amendment will establish more flexibility for institutions to administer the drug-testing consent form in those sports that do not begin a playing segment prior to or during the hectic first three weeks of classes. The amendment is supported by the Council. I urge your support.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I urge your support for this proposal. We realize that it will cost increased efforts on your behalf. However, this

General Business Session ______ 335

legislation is vital to the drug-testing program. An interpretation will provide us with some relief and that being, with the exception of the fall athlete, it will apply to only the recruited and returning student athletes. Secondly, we will ask the Council to sponsor legislation at the 1993 Convention to move this from the constitution to the bylaws for a more federated approach. Thank you for your support.

Marilyn A. Maurer (Kalamazoo College): I still have some fears about this legislation, particularly for those of us in Division III. I think; we may be placed in an untenable position. Those of us with athletes who compete in the winter and spring, who are off campus in the fall on regular college programs are going to be unable to do this. I believe that we need some assurance that those athletes will be eligible in 1992 before we come back in 1993 to handle this problem. We don't want athletes ineligible in 1992.

President Sweet: The Council did discuss your concern and determined that if the students were not on campus, that those students would not be subject to this provision until they returned to campus.

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): For those individuals in Divisions II and III, this was discussed at length, and there will be relief in terms of verifying the drug-testing consent form for those individuals who are nonrecruited or walk-ons. This situation is for those individuals who are returning or recruited student-athletes. It want to remind everybody here that it is vital that this legislation pass and that we get a separate drug-testing consent form so that from the liability standpoint the Association is on solid ground.

Wendy Gates Troxel (Dartmouth College): I would like also to get a further clarification on a scenario that a recruited athlete may compete his or her freshman year, and for whatever reason—most of the time these students in our situation are not on athletics scholarships, and certainly in our situation they may not compete or appear on a squad list their sophomore year—wish to return their junior year to complete their two years of remaining eligibility.

President Sweet: The response is that if the students do not participate in their sophomore year, as you described, and it is in their junior year they are going to participate, it will be in the junior year that they would need to comply with this regulation.

[Proposal No. 41-1 (Page A-68) was approved.]

Malcolm C. McInnis Jr. (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): In 1990, the Convention adopted legislation authorizing a year-round drug-testing program. Now in its second year, the year-round program has had a significant impact on the use of anabolic steroids by Division I football players. Proposal No. 41 is intended to address issues regarding the signing of the drug-testing consent form, issues that have surfaced as a result of the year-round testing. The timing of your year-round testing necessitates that the drug-testing consent form be administered and signed earlier than the student-athlete statement.

Further, it is necessary that all student-athletes associated with the

______1992 Convention Proceedings

testing and have executed the consent form prior to the NCAA drug testing and have executed the consent form prior to the NCAA selection. Rather than modify the student-athlete statement to meet the needs of the drug-testing program, the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports recommended that the drug-testing consent be removed from the statement and administered and signed to meet the needs of the year-round and postseason drug-testing programs. This legislation is supported by the competitive safeguards committee and the NCAA Council and has an August 1, 1992, effective date. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 41, Parts A through C (Page A-65) were approved as amended by No. 41-1. Parts D and F (Page A-67) were approved by Divisions I and II. Part E was approved.]

Hardship Waiver

F.G. Jean Cerra (Barry University): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 43 for Division II.

[The motion was seconded.]

In light of the fact that it has passed in Division I to exclude scrimmages from the hardship-waiver calculations, I would like to impose a comparable requirement for Division II.

[Proposal No. 43 (Page A-70) was approved by Division II.]

Amateurism—Contract Negotiations

Frank Windegger (Texas Christian University): Madam President, on behalf of the NCAA Council and the NCAA Professional Sports Liaison Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently in the sports of baseball and ice hockey, a student-athlete can be drafted without his knowledge or permission. Professional sports teams direct the student-athlete in these sports to contact them concerning the professional sports contract after he has been drafted. Under current NCAA regulations, these athletes are unable to establish an accurate market value of their services because they are not permitted to enter into negotiations with the professional organization. However, to skirt the current restrictions, student-athletes utilize advisers to assist them in establishing an accurate market value in order for them to determine whether it is in their best interest to give up their amateur status and turn professional.

The adoption of this proposal would give the student-athlete the opportunity to negotiate with the professional organization and place all contract discussions with the professional teams above reproach. The proposal would allow the student-athlete, his or her guardians, or the institutional's professional sports panel to enter into negotiations with the professional team and without the interference of an outside representative. The Professional Sports Liaison Committee and the Council urge your support for this Proposal.

James M. O'Fallon (University of Oregon): I would like to call the membership's attention to one particular part of this provision that I believe is fraught with potential liability for the membership. That is

	4	Congral	Business	Session	
2	1	Generai	Dusiness	26221011	-

the involvement of the institution's panel, potentially as negotiators for student-athletes in relationship with professional sports organizations. At the point that the panel enters into that kind of relationship it immediately has a fiduciary responsibility to the student-athlete-atthe same time that it maintains a responsibility as an agency of the institution to the institution itself.

What we have here is a legislative conflict of interest. My suggestion is that any court confronted with a disappointed student-athlete would answer the question of whether there is liability immediately in the affirmative as a result of that conflict of interest. and the only remaining question would be what is the degree of liability that it will attach to the institution. One doesn't need too much imagination to figure out how this could possibly impose significant liability on us. For a student-athlete who bypasses—on the recommendation of the panel—an opportunity to present himself for professional play and then blows a knee out immediately in spring practice, the question is how much is that knee worth.

On the other hand, a student-athlete who, on the basis of negotiations between the sports panel and the agency, has determined there is probably a market value, enters the draft, forfeits future collegiate eligibility and then is not drafted. In either of those situations, there is a very strong potential for liability. The overall concern that the committee represents here is a legitimate one, but there is a huge mistake in including the institution's panel in a negotiating role for the student-athlete.

I would, therefore, like to move that this legislation be referred back to the Council and to the subcommittee that produced it.

[The motion was seconded.]

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): The need for further study, I think, is really not present. The issue that has been raised about possible liability by virtue of actions of a sports panel is one that has been discussed. There are two thoughts that I think have guided those who think this is good legislation. One is that any time university personnel act on behalf of students, there is always the possibility of a misjudgment and possible liability. Now, yes, there may be magnified liability when a person's future earnings are at stake and some folks think that future earnings of people in professional sports are perhaps greater than future earnings of doctors and that sort of thing. The idea of providing services for student-athletes by the sports panel is really not different from other kinds of services that the universities provide the students.

The second thought is that this is only permissive. The sports panel is not required to be active in this way. There are not too many instances in which the sports panels will choose to be active in this way. So, the point is that the motion to refer is really not needed.

Charles Theokas (Temple University): I am chair of the Professional Sports Liaison Committee and I would hope that the group this afternoon would act on this piece of legislation rather than referring it back to the committee. The legal ramifications have been reviewed by persons within the organization and as the previous speaker said, anything that happens on our university campuses, in fact, has potential exposure. We are talking about the rights of student-athletes. I would hope that the spirit of the group this afternoon is to vote no against referral. Thank you.

Mr. O'Fallon: Just one brief response to the suggestion that this is no different than any instances in which we represent our students. There is in this situation a conflict of interest intent in relationship that does not exist generally in our provision of services for advice to our at ristudents or our student-athletes. That element has not been addressed,

but we believe there is no problem here.

Mr. Windegger: So it is very clear, this legislation establishes no requirements for an institution. It is permissive legislation. Therefore, it gives each institution the opportunity to consider the extent of its involvement in this type of activity. If an institution has substantial concerns about potential liability, legal or otherwise, it simply can Thoose not to be involved to this degree.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 47, Part A, was defeated.]

Mr. Theokas: I am the chair of the Professional Sports Liaison *Committee and we have been wrestling as a committee, and I know the NCAA has been wrestling as a group, for many years as to how to continue to further assist our student-athletes. I dare say that in this particular book that we have in front of us this afternoon there is not one single piece of legislation that can assist student-athletes in their rights as Proposal No. 47 does. It is very simple. There are three elements.

We are talking about allowing a student-athlete to request information about his or her fiscal opportunities - professional opportunities as they present themselves. We are allowing the student-athlete, who has been involuntarily drafted by either baseball or hockey, to negotiate in good faith, all dealing with the help of those who choose to help on our campuses and/or parents or guardian. We have specifically, if you will read the legislation, said that they cannot use an agent.

Last year, this body asked us to go back and present to the Council legislation as it relates to the rights of student-athletes. What you have before you is a modified but healthy version of what we feel is a good piece of legislation, a piece of legislation that I am certain if you would ask any student-athlete how they felt about having this opportunity, they would feel very comfortable.

I would hope that everybody in this room would support this piece of legislation. I certainly would like to thank everyone in advance for their support. I would like to thank you in advance, not in behalf of the committee or Charlie Theokas, but those student-athletes who have been living with an old piece of legislation that needs to be revised and that in some small way will help those students.

Michael B. McGee (Southern California University): We want to caution against a surface view of what might be a favorable reaction to

General Business Session ____

this amendment based on the fact that it provides student-athletes increased options. The majority of the Pacific-10 institutions and their coaches believe this proposal is dangerous and it is likely to have negative effects upon academics and the student-athlete development, and with the further likely outcome of increasing, not decreasing, sports agents' intrusion into the student-athletes' lives during their freshman, sophomore and junior years in residence. We urge defeat of this proposal.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): I would like a clarification from the Professional Sports Liaison Committee. If the student-athlete in question is a football player, does this legislation assume that that athlete will determine his market value by entering the NFL draft?

Mr. Theokas: Thank you for that question. In fact, it does not affect football players or basketball players. This piece of legislation affects baseball players and hockey players. That question that you asked about the football player: if he raises his hand and avails himself to the draft, he at that particular instance is a professional athlete. So that is a voluntary submission to the draft. This is to assist those who have involuntarily been drafted by professional sports organizations who have the right to do that and can do that. It will not affect any football or basketball players as we are presently structured.

Jeffrey A. Howard (Georgia Institute of Technology): I am a member of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Our committee supports this based on the fact that we are allowed to make a very informed decision upon entering an institution and we feel the option should also be ours to make an informed consent upon leaving there and especially considering the money that is at hand.

[Proposal No. 47, Part A, was approved by all three divisions after a motion to refer was defeated. Part B was approved by all three divisions.]

Cancellation of Financial Aid

R. Elaine Dreidame (University of Dayton): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 68.

[The motion was seconded.]

Michael Parent (Utah State University): Madam President, on behalf of the sponsors, I would like to move Amendment-to-amendment No. 68-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 68-1 simply specifies that any aid that is gradated or cancelled for Proposal No. 68 will not be reawarded during that term.

[Proposal No. 68-1 (Page A-97) was approved.]

Ms. Dreidame: Proposal 68 simply allows for the immediate cancellation of institutional financial aid in the event the student-athlete voluntarily withdraws from the sport prior to the institution's first competition in that sport. Current NCAA legislation indicates an institution may gradate or cancel the institutional financial aid during the period of the award in instances when the recipient voluntarily withdraws from the sport for personal reasons but only if the gradation

or cancellation does not occur prior to the conclusion of that semester or quarter. It is the Council's view that this proposal continues to provide institutions with discretion to gradate or cancel the aid of a student-athlete who has withdrawn from participation while offering increased flexibility to terminate immediately the institution's financial aid commitment to a student-athlete who does not intend to compete at the institution. This proposal is supported by the NCAA Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 68 (Page A-96) was approved as amended by No. 68-

Tuition Awards—Former Student-Athletes

Michael T. Christy (Iona College): On behalf of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference, I would like to move Proposal No. 69.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation addresses a very serious issue for the membership involving graduation rates of student-athletes. I think it is generally understood that poor graduation rates of student-athletes is one of the major problems in the public perception of the member institutions. This is particularly so for those who have participated for four years of competition. This legislation would correct some of these inequities and allow those students the opportunity to complete their studies. I think it is important to note that the maintaining of a strong public perception is very important to member institutions in maintaining public trust. This is an issue that goes far beyond the athletics field. I think it is time that we accept some of the responsibility for ensuring that student-athletes have the opportunity to complete their studies, and this should be on the member institutions.

As stated before, many of the issues of difficulty for member institutions have been focused on recruiting violations. These have been characterized as actions of individuals. I think the failure to graduate a significant number of our student-athletes is more serious since it is an institutional issue. I think this Convention has made some excellent progress in helping students become eligible for graduation through the imposition of certain legislation that has been passed already. I think it would help institutions recruit students who are more likely to graduate, would make it a goal to work with the high schools and the students to ensure that they have these opportunities, and our commitment to student-athletes beyond their playing time will be well recognized. That is very important in maintaining this public trust to which I have referred.

A program similar to this legislation is currently in existence and supported by the 80 Division I institutions through the National Consortium of Academics and Sports. These 80 institutions have merged to support student-athletes in the completion of their studies in exchange for their participation in various educational programs at the primary, secondary level on drug education and the importance of remaining in school. While this is not required by this legislation, I think that we will find these student-athletes will be very helpful in

supporting this kind of work in the future. This legislation, while deemed to be expensive, is supported by members of private institutions that recognize that the commitment to athletics goes far beyond the minimal financial aid requirements. We are willing to support these athletes to the completion of their studies. At this time, I believe it is the right thing to do. Thank you.

James M. O'Fallon (University of Oregon): With my immediate record, I probably should not speak at all. I have to say I am speaking on behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference. This is a form of legislation that I think we all have become fairly familiar with generally emanating from Washington, D.C. It springs from the best of intentions and goes about creating unfunded liabilities for other people. The reality here is, that every school that can afford it is in a position to choose to support its student-athletes after they have exhausted their athletics eligibility.

Many of our student-athletes do not need the same degree of support, when they are no longer involved in athletics as they do while they are involved in athletics because they have a considerably greater period of time to work and can work. There are a variety of ways to do this. This would mandate, in effect, that the person who came back to school after three or four successful years in the professional ranks would have to be supported by a full tuition scholarship, and that a person who was in a great deal of need in other places in the university might be deprived due to the fact that resources are not there.

The basic point, I suppose, is that we do not need to mandate this. It is available, and most of our institutions already have it; and as the previous speaker indicated, they will find some way to support studentathletes.

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 69. The Council is opposed to this legislation because it believes there is already a provision in the legislation to permit institutions to provide financial assistance to the student-athletes who have exhausted athletics eligibility and that the adoption of this proposal could create an undue financial burden on member institutions. Furthermore, this proposal would mandate that an institution provide tuition awards to former student-athletes who were on full grants-in-aid and who had not completed graduation requirements. Further, the proposal places no restriction on the time period during which the institution would be responsible for providing tuition awards to former student-athletes. For these reasons and those cited by the previous speaker, the Council would urge the membership to not approve Proposal No. 69. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 69, Parts A and B (Page A-98) was defeated. Part C was moot.]

Resolution: Federally Mandated Disclosure of Athletically Related Revenues and Expenditures

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): I would move Proposal No. 154 on behalf of the Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

Well would move that this be a roll-call vote.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Madam President, Proposal No. 154 is a resolution opposing the Henry Financial Disclosure Amendment now pending in the Congress. This amendment, attached to the House version of the Higher Education Reauthorization Act, would require Divisions I and II institutions annually to compile and make publicly available on an individual sport basis the audited revenues and expenditures related to their athletics departments and intercollegiate athletics activities.

The NCAA, through its staff and through Washington legislative counsel, has been opposing this proposal for more than two years. The NCAA's opposition has been principally based upon the significant time and expense that would be involved in compiling this data each year by individual sport and then causing the independent audit to be made by an accounting firm. The NCAA's opposition is also based upon the fact that as soon as this data becomes available newspaper reporters and others will with certainty begin to make sport comparisons between institutions. As we all know, differences in revenues and expenditures by individual sports can and do arise from a host of factors ranging from differences in accounting methods to a number of other reasons.

It has been said in the Congress that NCAA members are really not opposed to this proposal. The Council, with support from the Presidents Commission, has brought this resolution before you to provide you with an opportunity to make your individual and collective positions clear. The Council urges that you vote in favor of the resolution and reminds you that an abstention for these purposes really is the equivalent of a no vote. Thank you.

Christine H. B. Grant (University of Iowa): For a few reasons, I am not inclined to be in favor of Resolution No. 154. One, many in the room have annually released their budgets on a sport-by-sport basis for several years. We have discovered that it is really no big deal. In fact, we may have diminished the chances of negative publicity by being so open with our information. Secondly, it is my understanding that any public institution must supply information on budgets if requested to do so. So nothing can protect us from the release of this information at all of our public institutions.

Number three, by passing this resolution, it seems to send a message to the nation that we have something to hide in athletics. I believe this is a very dangerous message to send. Finally, for all of the aforementioned reasons, it does not seem a wise expenditure of either time or money for our Association to focus on blocking this move to publish budgets.

[Proposal No. 154 (Page A-181) was approved, 561-154, 37 abstentions, roll-call vote.]

[The general business session was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.]

	2	12
al Rusiness Session	.	43
AL KUSINPSS NESSION		

Friday Morning, January 10, 1992

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m., with President Sweet presiding.

> **Division I Council and Presidents Commission Representatives**

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 109.

[The motion was seconded.]

Madam Chair, on behalf of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conferences we are proposing today Proposal No. 109, which, if passed, will provide input and access from each men's basketball Division I conference into the NCAA governance structure. It is an effort by the MAAC to provide equity if not equality in the NCAA governing structure. The rationale behind this is basic. The importance of representation on the Council and the Presidents Commission has become increasingly evident over the last three Conventions.

Without access by the entire Division I membership with at least ax representative on either the Commission or the Council, many Division I member conferences feel locked out of the process. I would point out a few things. First, this does not benefit directly the MAAC as we will have a member on the Commission beginning this year. Second, it does not deny certain subgroups of Division I the ability to have every one of their conferences represented on the Council or the Commission. It only requires that between the Commission and the Council that every conference have at least one member represented on those boards. We think it is a basic fairness issue and that it will help the governance process and is offered in that spirit. I thank you and ask you for your support.

Asa N. Green (Livingston College): Thank you, Madam Chair. The NCAA Council and the Presidents Commission, for whom I speak, are strongly opposed to Proposal No. 109. While it would be nice to have every conference represented on either the Commission or the Council, it would upset a very delicate representational balance that has existed on the Council for most of two decades and for the Commission since its inception some eight years ago. Both groups are working well. I personally have served on both groups, and I think that the interest of a very diverse membership is well represented on both.

The fact of the matter is that Division I-A, if one considers the fact that it generates something between 75 and 80 percent of all of the revenues of this Association, has always been satisfied with a representation of approximately half of the available Division I positions. That division could have in past years very successfully argued, I think, and could still cogently argue that they should be entitled to greater representation. To reduce I-A to minority representation on the Division I segment would be, I think, unwise and would seriously jeopardize the effectiveness of both groups. I would hope that the membership would defeat No. 109. Thank you.

Curtis L. McCray (California State University, Long Beach):

______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

Madam Chair, on behalf of the Presidents Commission, I wish to register the Commission's opposition to Proposal No. 109 and urge its defeat. Thank you.

a Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): Thank you, Madam President. I a, am vice-president of Division III. In addition to the previously mentioned reasons, I would like to remind my colleagues in Division III that we are presently being subsidized at record levels with the current representation on the Council. Changing this one accommodation will jeopardize

the financial assets of our championships.

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): Speaking on behalf of the Council and as vice-president of Division II, I would urge the membership to defeat this proposal. As it has been stated, it clearly is an unwise piece of legislation. The issue of fairness, I think, is adequately addressed and the Council membership is a representative body. Quite honestly, in the three years I have been on the Council, it is clear that regardless of different conferences' positions, those positions usually and most often find their way to Council agenda and are thoroughly discussed. I think the fairness issue is moot in this case. I would urge the Division II membership to vote against the proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 109 (Page A-136) was defeated.]

Amendment-Sponsorship

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): Madam Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 112.

[The motion was seconded.]

Originally, this proposal was to be in the consent package and one might think it should have been. Apparently, there was some concern that some conferences without presidential structures in place might be bothered by this concept. I hope it reflects more caution than insight. This proposal, recommended to us in 1988 by our advisory committee on governance matters, attempts to strengthen the role of the chief executive officer and the conference. It says that if a conference submits proposed legislation for an NCAA Convention such submission must be signed by the chair of the conference's official presidential group. If the conference has no such presidential group, then the legislative submission must be signed by at least two CEOs of member institutions in the conference. In an era when presidents and chancellors are ultimately responsible for intercollegiate athletics, this does not seem to be obtrusive or burdensome. In fact, it is totally logical. The Council joins the Commission asking for your vote in support of item No. 112.

[Proposal No. 112 (Page A-139) was approved.]

Amendments to Federated Provisions

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas at Austin): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move Proposal No. 113.

[The motion was seconded.]

This also should have been in the consent package. If you will just read the intent statement, I think it is self-explanatory. I urge your

General Business Session	_ 345	j
--------------------------	-------	---

approval of No. 113.

[Proposal No. 113 (Page A-140) was approved.]

Revised Legislative Calendar

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 114.

[The motion was seconded.]

Fellow delegates, Proposal No. 114 would perform the important function of moving back in the year by one month's time the legislative, deadlines we now face. It would make them much more compatible with the academic calendar. It would move back by one month the comment period to a time when people are on campus. It would move back the deadline for the Council and the Presidents Commission to submit their legislative proposals and permit them to have a late September, meeting and still submit legislation. I believe this would be very beneficial to the membership and to the legislative process of the Association.

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): On behalf of the NCAA Council; I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 114. As you know, the legislative calendar under which we are operating at the present time has only been in effect for two years. The Legislative Review Committee has studied this issue carefully and we believe that the present calendar should be given adequate opportunity to be tested before we make any changes in that calendar. The present calendar does seem to be an effective one, and I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 114.

Carl F. Ullrich (Patriot League): The delegation just passed No. 112. I would point out as a conference commissioner that it is difficult to communicate with presidents through that summer period. This particular legislative calendar move will aid all of us working in trying to get our athletics directors and our presidents involved in legislation. It is a much easier time frame to do that. I urge your approval of this. I think it will make our legislative process work much better.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge the defeat of Proposal No. 114. As you heard, the issues have been studied carefully by the Council and the Legislative Review Committee, and the Presidents Commission. We agree with the recommendations that for the current calendar to be an effective one it should not be changed at this time. If I might add, it is very important when we have the critical issues that we have been debating in the last few years that there be ample dialogue for concrete proposals. The current schedule allows proposals to be received by the entire NCAA community and discussed with the potential for revision. I urge that we keep the current calendar.

Roy Kramer (Southeastern Conference): On behalf of the College Commissioners Association and the members of those institutions that propose the vast majority of legislation we vote on, who are not permitted the freedom of the Council or the Presidents Commission to adjust and to adapt to later dates, and those of us who have to run down chief executive officers over the course of June and July, right after the

legislation rather than just administering it, I urge that you support this piece of legislation. conference meetings, and who know the practicality of submitting

[Proposal No. 114 (Page A-141) was defeated, 391-238, two abstentions; two-thirds majority required for passage.]

Reconsideration of Division I-AAA Football (34)

Kendrick W. Walker (California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo): I move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 34 in Division Was Hel voted on the prevailing side.

: [The motion was seconded.]

Thomas Iannacone (University of San Diego): I believe in talking to many of the Division II membership that their major concern with the legislation yesterday was Section C that would somehow lock them out in the future should they decide that they would like to move their programs to Division I. I believe it was explained yesterday by members of Division II that this was the recommendation of the Division II leadership. The committee is certainly willing to take a less restrictive approach. We are concerned that a year from now would be *too late, putting many of our programs in limbo.

I believe that the Presidents Commission spoke yesterday that it would favor revisiting Section C next year, and I think that the members of the Presidents Commission will speak to that issues this morning. I also urge you to be aware of much erroneous information that I found to have affected certain votes. I will just give you one example. Although I-AAA would fail today, an institution such as mine would be permitted to continue to play in Division III. We all know how erroneous that is. That was voted out with Proposal No. 53 last year. This legislation is very educationally sound, and it is fiscally responsible, and I urge the Division II membership to look at the facts. Not all of us are going to have an opportunity to continue with our programs that would meet the mission statement of our universities. I, for example, the University of San Diego, am the only Division I institution playing in Division III football west of Iowa. So, obviously, I have some difficulties. There are those in the Midwest and also in the South. I urge your reconsideration and your support. Thank you.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): I wish to speak in favor of reconsideration from this perspective. Several members of the Presidents Commission mentioned yesterday that if the concern by the Division II membership is Subsection C, the permanent prohibition of mobility, and it is the will of the Division II leadership that that be removed, the Presidents Commission will be happy to consider that issue in the coming year. So, we would look to the guidance of Division II membership on that issue and would consider it in the coming year. Thank you very much.

Robert A. Oliver (University of Northern Colorado): As a member of the Division II Steering Committee, I would urge the Division II membership to favor reconsideration. If you remember, about three or four months ago the committee that dealt with I-AAA surveyed the

General Business Session _____

ings	3 700

Division II membership and the Division II membership indicated it was not interested in I-AAA football. I would encourage us to reconsider I-AAA as we are the only division that voted it down and give this committee that worked very hard for 12 months an opportunity to provide an opportunity for those people in Division I that want nonscholarship football.

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference): The intent of the motion to reconsider is clear and simple. Division II does not support the legislation because of Part C. If Division II can be convinced this portion of the legislation will be eliminated at some time in the future, their objections will be overcome and Proposal 34 will survive this Convention. I would caution that the matter is not that simple and I would offer one question to emphasize my point. If Part C is removed, will it not be less costly for Division II members to drop football scholarships, opt instead for cheaper I-AAA football, and put the money saved into upgrading their own programs, especially men's basketball, and move to Division I? Removal of Part C, then, may remedy Division II's access problems while creating a potentially larger threat of attrition. I simply caution that Proposal No. 34 is complex. It is complex legislation and it seems unwise to apply a quick fix with ramifications beyond the matter at hand. Please defeat the proposal to reconsider.

James F. Battle (Virginia Union University): I would urge the Division II membership to defeat this proposal. This is not a good piece of legislation for Division II. It would have an adverse effect on our ability to recruit the type of athlete that we need to have competitive programs. It is not a matter of the C portion. It is the entire package. This is a survival type of situation for Division II. We all know that athletes who we recruit all want to go to the Division I programs. The issue of facilities, personnel and other support mechanisms on campus in a Division I institution makes a Division I program, whether it is I-AAA or I-AA, whatever the case may be, more attractive to the athletes that we need to recruit to keep our programs competitive. I would like to urge the Division II membership to defeat this proposal simply because it is not good legislation for Division II. Thank you.

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): I think that it is clear that during the past few hours there has been a lot of discussion among the Division II membership regarding its vote on Proposal No. 34. I know that it is difficult within the short period of time to convince people to change their mind on a position that perhaps they have taken a long time to reach. Nevertheless, I think that this proposal is worth reconsidering. I think that there are some issues that clearly have come out as a result of debate on this matter. They can be resolved over the next few months. The Presidents Commission has committed itself to working with the Division II Steering Committee to try to iron out some of these difficulties.

I stand before the Division II delegates this morning to promise that the Division II Steering Committee will work with the Presidents Commission to address some of the issues that have been raised. What I think the bottom line is in this, ladies and gentlemen, is simply that this piece of legislation, like any other piece of legislation, can be viewed from very different perspectives and some good parts of it can be identified and some bad parts can be identified. It is an accommodation. There is no other way to put it. It is a piece of legislation that accommodates a situation that was created by this Convention a year ago, and there was a commitment on behalf of this Convention to work with the I-AAA people to see if we could come up with some kind of resolution for the dilemma they faced.

I don't think this piece of legislation causes the dire threat that some believe it does in Division II. There were some aspects of the legislation that need to be fine-tuned and I think we can do that over the next couple of months. I would urge the Division II membership to consider reconsideration of Proposal No. 34. Thank you.

Benny Hollis (Northeast Louisiana University): During the special Convention in St. Louis in 1981, most of the I-AA membership was relegated to this division by this Convention. Several of us appealed to move back to Division I-A with very little success. Since that time, only two schools, Louisiana Tech and the University of Akron, have successfully moved from I-AA to I-A. Why? Because it is very expensive to enlarge stadiums, add coaching staffs and additional scholarships. It runs into the millions.

There is a price to pay in Division I. If you were to ask for a waiver of I-A to waive the stadium size and attendance requirements, I think you know what the results of that would be. Yet with a stroke of a pen, we will allow people to go from Division III to Division I. Now, that is just wrong. There are a lot of us who have paid a price and that is just not right. If you would look at it, that kind of legislation—I respect our presidents and the Presidents Commission—I think that there has got to be another solution to this problem of finding a home for these people rather than creating another division. I encourage the membership to defeat this appeal.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 34 in Division II was defeated, 49-109, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

[NOTE: The delegates heard the reports of the Men's and Women's Committees on Committees and the Nominating Committee and approved the slate of candidates.]

Legislative Deadlines—Submission Dates and Times

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 115.

[The motion was seconded.]

General Business Session _

Because of the concerns that were raised this year regarding the long established deadline of 5 p.m. Central Time for submission of amendments and amendments-to-amendments to the national office, the Council believes it is necessary to codify this deadline. Even though the deadline is specified in all mailings that are sent to the membership explaining the amendment and amendments-to-the-amendment pro-

48	 1992 Convention	Proceeding

cesses, it is felt that making it a part of the legislation will remove all doubts in the minds of the membership.

On behalf of the Council, I believe it is necessary to address a point that has been made in opposition to this proposal. There are individuals who believe that a later deadline would be more appropriate in order to give member institutions and conferences on the West Coast, of which I am a member, equal time to submit the proposals by fax. These individuals also contend that it would not be necessary for the NCAA staff to remain at the office until the deadline to monitor the transmissions of such amendments. However, it is the staff's opinion and the opinion of many of us that they would have to remain until the deadline, whatever the deadline is.

Fax machines are not foolproof and transmissions often are incomplete; and in such instances, the staff attempts to notify the sender so the item can be resent. It also is possible for a fax machine to run out of paper, especially with a large volume of items being transmitted in a short period of time. Furthermore, amendments sometimes are submitted with the wrong signature; and although the staff does not have to do so, they attempt to notify the sponsor so the correct signature can be obtained prior to the deadline. In short, it does appear that the staff will have to remain at the office until the deadline has passed even if the deadline is midnight, so that the submissions can be adequately monitored.

Any deadline will be somewhat arbitrary. Therefore, it seems that the close of business of the national office at 5 p.m. Central Time is the most reasonable deadline and thus I urge your support of this proposal.

Marilyn Moniz-Kahoohanohano (University of Hawaii): Representing the University of Hawaii and the Big West Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 115-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Because of the time in Hawaii, under the current policy and practice, it requires us to be five hours earlier in submitting our legislative proposals. In effect, this gives us five fewer hours to submit our legislative amendments as the deadline is 5 p.m. Central Time, which means noon for us. Those institutions located in the Pacific and Mountain time zones have also fewer hours to meet the deadline. This practice is unfair and discriminatory. This amendment-to-the-amendment would allow all institutions across the country to utilize their entire work day.

Since fax machines date and time all receptions, monitoring is done automatically. Every institution should have the same opportunity in terms of length of time to submit such important proposals. We ask for your support in passing No. 115-1 to change the 5 p.m. Central Time deadline to midnight Central Time.

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): I would like to remind the membership that regardless of what time you set, somebody on the East is going to continue to have an advantage. We may all want to sit in our office until 11 o'clock and then fax the fax just to get in

under the deadline. I would urge defeat of No. 115-1 and the support of No. 115. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 115-1 (Page A-144) was defeated, 256-353, 19 ['abstentions.]

[Proposal No. 115 (Page A-143) was approved.]

Resolution: Council Waiver Authority

Robert A. Oliver (University of Northern Colorado): Madam Chair, move adoption of Proposal No. 117.

[The motion was seconded.]

The subject of increased waiver authority for the Council or some other body is one that has been discussed at a number of times during the past. In fact, legislation to give the Council such authority was defeated at the 1988 Convention and for good reasons. Two of the most often cited concerns of such increased authority was the possibility of increased vulnerability to litigation and the possibility of submission of numerous waiver requests. However, because situations appear to arise every year, that it does not appear a specific piece of legislation was meant to affect and for which there is no legislative authority to even consider granting a waiver, the Council believes that it is appropriate to study this issue further and to adopt legislation for the 1993 Convention that would grant such waiver authority to the Council if it believes such legislation is appropriate. I urge you to adopt this resolution.

[Proposal No. 117 (Page A-145) was approved.]

Division-Specific Playing Rules

· Martha E. Hawthorne (Rice University): On behalf of the Executive Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 118.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the 1991 NCAA Convention, the membership approved Proposal No. 63, which was a resolution calling for a study to determine the feasibility and desirability of developing more flexible playing rules to accommodate the differences in the Association's membership divisions, and if appropriate, to recommend proposed legislation for Council sponsorship at the 1992 NCAA Convention, Proposal No. 118 is the response to that resolution. After study and discussion by an hoc group charged with reviewing the resolution, the Executive Committee and the division championships committees received and approved recommendations to expand the oversight responsibilities of the Executive Committee to consider appeals of playing rules for the division-wide exceptions based on significant financial impact. Additionally, the Executive Committee approved the definition of significant financial impact as any rule change that would exceed \$1,000 in commonly accepted implementation cost. In other words, what most institutions in a division would spend to implement a rule change rather than the least expensive solution possible.

The Executive Committee also approved these philosophical conditions suggested by the ad hoc group: (1) The structural integrity of the sport should be a guiding principle in establishing playing rules.

Therefore, appeals based on significant participation impact or philosophical differences are not a part of this legislation. (2) In order to safeguard the structural integrity of the sport, the opportunity to appeal should be easily available, but approval should be difficult to obtain.

In view of this latter position, the Executive Committee approved the following procedures for the processing of an exceptional appeal: (1) An appeal for the Division I exception can be made by the appropriate, sports committee with rules-making responsibilities by division championships committee, and the Executive Committee or eight member institutions, not all of whom can be from the same conference. (2) And appeal that originates from a source other than a sports committee will be referred to the sports committee for study and for recommendation: (3) The sports committee will solicit opinions from the division seeking. the exception through a survey prepared and tabulated by the national office. Language for the survey will be approved by the committee or the institutions originating the appeal. Although the sports committee and division championship committees or the Executive Committee are not bound by the results of the study, a majority of the members in a division who sponsor the sport should desire the exception for it to be considered favorably. (4) The sports committee must report to the division championships committee on its study and rationale for its decision either to recommend approval or disapproval of the appeal.

Finally, after deliberation the ad hoc committee and the Executive Committee recognized the frustration felt in some parts over differences in how large portions of divisions believe a particular sport should be played. Typically, these differences are based on the perceived desirability of elite competition versus greater participation. However, both committees concluded that the guiding principles in making rules should be structural integrity of the sport. Proposal No. 118 assures the continuation of these guiding principles, while allowing divisions specific exemptions to playing rules where there is significant financial impact.

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): I rise to commend the authors of this legislation. They have done a beautiful job, and I would like to remind the entire constituency that this has no impact on any other division. However, it does allow Division III to escape some financial impacts that could very greatly threaten our support of that sport. This is the legislation we have been working for for two years, so let's support it.

[Proposal No. 118 (Page A-146) was approved by all three divisions.]

Surgical Expenses

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): As a member of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 119.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of this proposal will permit member institutions to provide surgical expenses to student-athletes, including partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers, who are injured during the academic year while participating in voluntary physical activities designed to prepare them 'for competition. Under current legislation, a member institution may not provide surgical expenses to a student-athlete unless the injury cocurs as a result of practice for or participation in intercollegiate athletics competition at the institution, plus an institution may not pay surgical expenses for an injury that results from participation in voluntary activities such as weight training and conditioning activities, supervised only by the institution's weight and strength coach.

on many occasions, it is imperative that student-athletes participate in such activity to prepare them for future competition. Many of the voluntary physical activities are encouraged by coaches. Because of the resultant liability risk, it is appropriate that member institutions be permitted to pay for surgical expenses when injuries occur as a result of participating in such activities. It should be noted that in many instances institutional medical insurance will cover such expenses and will not result in additional expense to the institution. On behalf of the NCAA Council, I urge you to support the adoption of Proposal No. 119. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 119 (Page A-148) was approved.]

Resolution: NCAA Paperwork

Very Rev. Brian O'Connell (Niagara University): I move the adoption of Resolution No. 123.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this resolution is to establish a special committee to streamline NCAA paperwork. A number of analyses have shown that the paperwork and administrative costs in many sectors of the U.S. economy far exceed similar costs in other countries. Many see this as a critical weakness or disease in the system. I believe that the NCAA has caught this disease. My experience as president is that the level of paperwork and administrative attention generated by athletics is inordinate and disproportionate to its importance in the university.

Let me give one example of this tendency. Some self-studies in the pilot certification program have been twice as long as the self-study required for regional accrediting bodies. That turns the priorities of the university upside down. I notice that the certification committee has not completed its work yet, but there are enough established areas of paperwork in the NCAA that can be reviewed by this proposed committee.

I have heard a fair amount of lip service to administrative simplicity in this Convention, but often and for the best of motives we keep multiplying paperwork. We talk a lot about cost-containment, but we keep adding administrative costs. Some delegates may think the process of looking at governance for next year's Convention will take care of the paperwork issue. If this NCAA reform takes its normal course, it will result in more rules, less institutional autonomy and much more paperwork. In an era of tight budgets, I would rather spend money on athletics scholarships or add to the opportunities of students to participate in athletics. I urge your support of Resolution No. 123.

William E. Shelton (Eastern Michigan University): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 123. The Presidents Commission joins with the NCAA Council, I believe, in encouraging the defeat of this proposal. Adding another committee is not the answer to the challenge of paperwork. We have a staff that is looking at this right now. We have some other committees. already in the process. We don't believe another committee is needed for this. I urge your defeat of Proposal No. 123.

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): I rise to speak in opposition to this resolution as well. I think the membership needs to be aware of the fact that the Council, especially, is very concerned on a regular basis about the amount of paperwork being generated. In fact, it tries to eliminate as much of it as possible. It seems rather incongruous that we would create another committee that would require a lot of paperwork to deal with the paperwork issue, which is already being handled, we think, in an expeditious fashion as the Council does its regular business. I would urge the membership to vote against this proposal.

[Proposal No. 123 (Page A-151) was defeated.]

Resolution: Student-Athlete Committees

John R. Gerdy (Southeastern Conference): I move adoption of Resolution No. 124.

[The motion was seconded.]

This resolution asks that the NCAA Council, during the upcoming year, consider how the NCAA member institutions and conferences can. be encouraged to establish student-athlete advisory committees. In establishing the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, the Association took a significant step in creating input opportunities for student-athletes. However, opportunities for student-athletes to offer input and suggestions regarding academic, social and athletics experience need to be expanded on an institutional and conference level. Establishing student-athlete committees at the institutional and conference levels and linking those committees to the NCAA Student-Athlete Committee will provide an effective network for obtaining information regarding the student-athlete experience. I urge your support of this resolution.

John H. Harvey (Carnegie Mellon University): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I would like to support the adoption of Proposal No. 124. I believe that we have seen through the work of our NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee that it is important for the student-athletes to have a voice in the athletics structure. This resolution simply encourages member institutions and conferences to establish student-athlete committees. We believe this is a sensible and

fair resolution and we encourage your support.

Jason C. Wilkie (Central Michigan University): I am a member of the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. When the committees, began, it was stated that our purpose was to receive information on and. explanations of NCAA activities and legislation, to seek input and

insight regarding student-athletes. To accomplish this goal, a network of student-athlete advisory committees at the conference and institutional levels will need to be established. This would provide a base on which our own committee would receive input from the 300,000 student-athletes we represent. The NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges the adoption of this proposal to provide a voice for student-athletes at the institutional, conference and national level.

Brad W. Hovious (University of Texas at El Paso): Right now we have no rules that would prevent anybody from doing this, having a conference advisory committee or an institutional student advisory committee. So why do we have to pass a rule to study whether we ought to be allowed to do what we can do right now? I urge defeat of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 124 (Page A-151) was approved.]

Football-Visits to High School

Bill Belknap (Southland Conference): Madam Chair, I move Proposal No. 132 in behalf of Division I-AA.

The motion was seconded.]

As you just detailed to us, Proposal No. 132 passed in I-A. Division I-AA has not had the opportunity to vote on this. It is my judgment they should have that opportunity. Typically, we are interested in having r common recruiting rules with Division I-A. This would give us an opportunity to make an adjustment in order to have similar rules. ر Proposal No. 132 (Page A-160) was approved by Division I-AA.]

Resolution: NCAA-Sponsored Summer Basketball Camps

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the NCAA Recruiting Committee, I move Proposal No.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council, I move Amendment-to-amendment No. 141-1.

The motion was seconded.

General Business Session

Originally, the Council and the Recruiting Committee supported a resolution calling for the Association to administer summer basketball camps. The NCAA Executive Committee considered the expense of such a project and opposed the adoption of such a program. The resolution before this body today, No. 141-1, avoids the financial commitment of the Association but maintains some level of control over the perceived abuses of summer basketball camps. This resolution calls conjunction with the Women's Basketball Coaches Association and the National Association of Basketball Coaches, to develop a program to certify summer basketball camps beginning in the summer of 1993. The Council believes that a certification effort on the national level will address the concerns that the basketball committee has regarding privately owned basketball camps. We would appreciate your support of this proposal.

William E. Shelton (Eastern Michigan University): I rise on behalf of the Presidents Commission in support of No. 141-1. The Presidents

ni.	nz.	51	,Š,		
	a.	4.	3 %	£	

1992 Convention Proce

Commission supports the idea of the NCAA certifying summer basket; ball camps. The Commission agrees that the NCAA certifying summer camps program will help curb what we believe are the abuses that are currently going on in many privately owned summer basketball camps. The Presidents Commission urges the adoption of No. 141-1.

[Proposal No. 141-1 (Page A-169) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 141 (Page A-168) was approved, as amended by No. 141-1.]

Unethical Conduct

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): Madam President; on behalf of the Committee on Infractions and the NCAA Council, I move Proposal No. 142.

[The motion was seconded.]

Before I begin discussion of this particular amendment, I would like to call your attention to a typographical omission in the last line on the bottom of page 160. That item, which is the present rule, should read "Unethical conduct by a prospective or enrolled student-athlete or institutional staff member." At present, the Committee on Infractions and the Association do not have the authority to request that a student-s athlete or an institutional staff member at another institution who might have very pertinent information related to a possible violation. under consideration by the committee at a hearing, appear either? voluntarily or involuntarily. The committee would like to have the opportunity to request that, if required, such person might and should come before the committee. This would be a matter that would be used, in very limited circumstances. We have presently moved to tape? recording all investigative inquiries and we believe that would reduce substantially the number of persons we might be interested in. This would be exceedingly limited. The student-athlete or institutional staff member would not be put at personal risk in appearing before the committee. It would merely assure that when that person came before. the committee he or she would be in the same circumstances as everybody else is and, that is, required to tell the truth. We would be assured and would provide assistance and develop guidelines to protect the rights and to provide assistance to those persons whom we require? to come before the committee. Therefore, we request that the membership endorse and approve this particular amendment.

Robert J. Desiderio (University of New Mexico): I ask that this body oppose this proposal. The basis of the proposal is to provide a substitute for subpoena power without any of the protections that subpoena power has. The NCAA is a private organization. It is a private institution and it has privileges. It also accepts responsibilities and costs, and one of those is not to have subpoena powers. It is true that without requiring people to give evidence at a hearing, that all the information may not be there. At the same time, the cost that we are imposing upon people is that we will label them as being unethical. At the same time these people who are students and employees of the university may not wish to attend on the advice of counsel or on the

advice of their parents. Yet, if they don't attend, we will say that they are unethical while they are doing what their conscience or someone who is advising them says they should do. I think that is wrong. I think tis time that we respect the rights of the individual even if it costs the needs of the group.

** [Proposal No. 142 (Page A-169) was defeated, 378-209, 18 abstentions, two-thirds majority required.]

Disciplinary Measures—Television Coverage

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): On behalf of the Committee on Infractions and the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal

The [The motion was seconded.]

In this instance, the committee wishes to bring the televisionappearance limitations into compliance with present technology. When the original television prohibition was adopted many years ago, it provided for delayed broadcasts in some limited circumstances. particularly relative to after 10:30 in the evening of the date of the game. Present technology-fiber optics, satellites, etc.-has made it such that 10:30 never seems to disappear within the NCAA territory. Therefore, what is often happening is that institutions that may be under this limitation can't place their games on television and be seen in other parts of the country, particularly in the Western regions. In the days of national recruiting, this appears to divide the clear intention of the membership, that the exposure and the recruiting benefits of appearing on television should not be gained. At the same time, we have institutions that, in trying to follow the limitations that presently exist, inadvertently find themselves violating the rules because some satellite transmitter picks this up and places the game in an area where it should not be.

Therefore, in order to bring the interpretation and the operation of the disciplinary action in line with present technological advancements, I move and encourage your adoption of Proposal No. 143. This would not, as you can see by the interpretations sent out to you at the time of the call of this Convention, eliminate the present permission for an institution to have coaches' shows, small segments appear in news broadcasts or institutional information. This merely deals with the delayed broadcasts.

[Proposal No. 143 (Page A-170) was approved.]

Disciplinary Measures—Broad-Based Revenue Distribution Moneys

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): Madam Chair, on behalf of the Committee on Infractions and the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 144.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is to bring the present legislation in line with the powers that the committee had prior to the adoption of the redistribution of income from the Association to member institutions. Under the broad-base distribution formulas that we have, the committee does not have the

eneral Business S	Session	 	35	
eneral pasiness -	, c 3 3 1 V 1			

authority to deal with this other than an outright ban on the distribution of these moneys primarily by either eliminating the sport or by: eliminating all grants-in-aid in that sport. We believe that it would be much more effective if the committee could deal with this in terms of a certain amount of money clearly defined over a specific period of time. We believe it will give us flexibility and will be beneficial to the membership generally.

[Proposal No. 144 (Page A-171) was approved.]

Division II Championships—Women's Field Hockey, Men's Ice Hockey and Men's Lacrosse

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Executive Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 145.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is in response to the membership's adoption of a resolution at the 1991 Convention that directed the Executive Commite tee to submit legislation to establish Division II championships in field hockey, men's ice hockey and men's lacrosse without those sports meeting the minimum sponsorship requirements of Bylaw 18.2. You will recall that also at the Convention legislation was adopted that prohibits a Division II institution from being eligible for the Division III, championship in a sport in which Division II does not offer a championship effective September 1992. The adoption of Proposal No. 145 will ensure that Division II institutions that sponsor those sports will have? the opportunity to compete for a national championship in their own. division. The resolution, directing the Executive Committee to submit this legislation, specified that the championships would be limited to two teams and it was adopted overwhelmingly at the 1991 Convention: On behalf of the Executive Committee, I urge your adoption of Proposal. No. 145.

James Jarrett (Old Dominion University): In an effort to follow through on the good faith and trust that came out of last year's meeting. and to continue that effort, I strongly support this legislation and ask

the I-AAA people to do so also.

Cedric W. Dempsey (University of Arizona): Speaking on behalf of the Executive Committee, we believe it is important to inform the membership of the committee's discussions relative to Proposal No. 145. The resolution, directing the Executive Committee to submit this proposal, which would establish three new championships, was related to the membership structure proposals. It would compensate in part for the legislation prohibiting Division II institutions from participating in Division III championships in those sports. While the Executive Committee is supportive of Proposal No. 145, it did raise a question of whether the membership intended that these championships would be subject at some point to the same sponsorship requirements as other championships, or whether they would continue indefinitely. In the absence of any provision to the contrary, it would appear that the latter is the case. In light of that, the Executive Committee does have some

concern about the establishment of additional championships.

In view of the need for increased fiscal responsibility, the current climate of cost-containment and the tenuous position of several National Collegiate Championships with the men's dwindling sponsorship, the Executive Committee plans to extend its August 1992 meeting by one full day to engage in some long-range planning relative to the championships program, including minimum sponsorship requirements as well as general philosophies and principles. It will make every effort to attempt to balance the interests and wishes of the membership with these concerns.

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): This legislation is in direct response to the overwhelming vote of this Convention last year. It formalizes the process that was adopted and does provide opportunities for these institutions to compete within their own membership divisions. We would appreciate your support on this legislation.

[Proposal No. 145 (Page A-172) was approved.]

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): Madam President, this is not a part of the printed agenda. I believe it is appropriate at this time for me to ask my fellow delegates to rise and express to you their deep appreciation for the fair and efficient and graceful way in which you have conducted the proceedings of this historic Convention. [Extended ovation.]

President Sweet: Thank you. I appreciate that. I will note that we are not finished yet and I hope I don't blow it. (Laughter)

Championship Critreria—Minimum Sponsorship Exemption : Phyllis L. Howlett (Big Ten Conference): On behalf of the Executive Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 146.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal essentially would ensure that National Collegiate Championships in men's volleyball, water polo, gymnastics and men's and women's rifle would continue through the 1993-94 academic year even if they failed to meet the minimum sponsorship requirements of Bylaw 18.2. Currently, these National Collegiate Championships, for which all divisions are eligible, must be sponsored by a minimum of 57 institutions in order to continue. If they fail to meet the minimum for two consecutive years, they may continue as long as their net receipts exceed all expenses or they maintain a sponsorship of 50.

In the latter case, they would not receive transportation and per diem expenses. Sponsorship of men's volleyball is 58, and men's water polo is 49. The men's gymnastics is 42 and men's and women's rifle is 55. The Executive Committee believes that it is important to provide the membership an opportunity to continue these championships for a limited period of time, especially since they represent the only championships opportunity in those sports. That is, no division championships exist in these sports, and in view of Proposal No. 145, which would establish three Division II championships with even fewer sponsoring institutions.

eneral Business Session	3.	59
EURIAL DROTHESS SESSION		-,

Lastly, you will recall that the membership at the 1991 Convention adopted a similar provision specifying that an existing Division.II championship would not be cancelled during 1991-92, 1992-93 or 1993-94 for failure to meet the minimum sponsorship requirements. Proposal No. 146 provides the same safeguard for these National Collegiate Championships in jeopardy of being discontinued. It is the Executive Committee's intent that upon the expiration of this legislation, after 1993-94, that these championships would be subject to current regulations regarding minimum sponsorship requirements and that any year or years after an event failed to meet the requirements during that three-year period would count against it upon the expiration of legislation. I urge your adoption of No. 146.

[Proposal No. 146 (Page A-173) was approved.]

Championship Criteria—Minimum Sponsorship Exemption Phyllis L. Howlett (Big Ten Conference): On behalf of the Executive Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 147.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is somewhat related to the previous proposal in that it would provide a more realistic time period for eliminating a National Collegiate Championship if it falls below the minimum sponsorship requirement or for eliminating transportation and per diem expenses for National Collegiate Championships that fall below the requirement but still maintain a sponsorship of at least 50 institutions. The Association's sponsorship record for these purposes is based on the figures as of September 30 each year. So, under the current regulation a National Collegiate Championship in these circumstances could be discontinued or its transportation and per diem expenses eliminated in the same year that it fails to meet these requirements. The adoption of Proposal No. 147 would eliminate that occurrence until the subsequent's academic year so that an event is not discontinued or its transportation and per diem expenses eliminated in mid-year.

[Proposal No. 147 (Page A-174) was approved.]

Interpretations Committee

John R. Gerdy (Southeastern Conference): I move the adoption of re-Proposal No. 150.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will specify that at least one member of the NCAA Interpretations Committee shall be an individual with primary responsibilities in the area of compliance at a Division I member: institution. It is believed that incorporating the perspective of the institutional compliance coordinator, who is most directly responsible for not only educating coaches and administrators regarding NCAA legislation, but for developing programs to ensure the proper application of NCAA legislation, will be a valuable addition to the Interpretations. Committee.

The perspective of the individual with hands-on expertise regarding legislative implementation at the institutional level should be included on the committee responsible for legislative interpretations. It should? be noted that this change would involve no additional cost to the Association and it would take effect upon the next Division I committee vacancy. I urge your support of this proposal.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I would simply like to concur with the previous speaker's comments and add one item which is that someone who works in this area on a day-by-day basis, I think, understands well the dynamics of what happens when you give an interpretation, the way it has an effect, the way it is seen. I think that it would be very important for that reason to have such a person on this committee. Of course, as the previous speaker really indicated, this involves no cost to the Association.

[Proposal No. 150 (Page A-176) was approved.]

NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 151.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee has been in existence for three years now and some strides have been made. Communication with student-athletes is occurring across the country and networking programs are being established and student-athletes have a voice in the Association's administrative process. The NCAA estimates it has nearly 300,000 student-athletes across the country, and it is almost an impossible task for a mere 16 student-athletes to try to represent this large group. Enlarging the committee will assist. In addition, the student-athletes cannot attend all of their meetings because of their playing and practice schedules. Our average attendance has been 11 students. Also and in addition, this proposal will allow student-athletes ¿to be reelected subject to the approval of the committee chair. Consistency is vital to the work of the committee and it is difficult to maintain continuity with the frequent departure of experienced committee members and the appointment of new ones. The adoption of this proposal will address that issue by expanding the committee's membership and permitting student-athletes to be reappointed. On behalf of the committee and the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 151.

Jason C. Wilkie (Central Michigan University): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 151 and we feel that this proposal will produce a broader representation of male and female athletes nationwide. It will also allow for more flexibility in meeting attendance of committee members by releasing pressures associated with committee meetings and the fulfillment of academic and athletics responsibilities. Representing more than 300,000 athletes—collegiate athletes—is a monumental task; and with your support of Proposal No. 151, you will be allowing the necessary growth of a committee whose dedication lies in the education and understanding of laws that govern those that we represent.

[Proposal No. 151 (Page A-177) was approved.]

Women's Volleyball Rules Committee

Cheryl L. Levick (Stanford University): Madam President; on behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference and the Big Sky Conference, I move Proposal No. 153.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of the proposal is to establish a women's volleyball rules committee. Women's volleyball has been a premium sport on the collegiate level. It has the second highest sponsorship across all divisions in the NCAA. It is our position that in order to ensure the attention, direction and control of this highly visible sport, the establishment of a separate rules committee is needed. Currently, the NCAA has a separate rules committee for baseball, men's and women's basketball, football, ice hockey, and men's and women's soccer. These committees give their full attention and time to separate rules. Women's volleyball should not be an exception. For collegiate women's volleyball, the current rules-making body of the National Association for Girls and Women in Sports governs the playing rules for all levels of girls in volleyball from high school to junior college and NAIA, etc. We have inadequate representation on this committee. Currently, Division I and Division III have no individual representatives. Proposal No. 153 is designed to provide representation of all divisions with the single focus on women's volleyball. The time has come to establish ther committee. Women's volleyball is a common sport on all campuses, with great fan appeal and strong financial support from our athletics budgets. It is proper that attention be given to these rules for this sport to meet the demands of this development. I urge your support of this proposal.

Christine W. Hoyles (Pacific-10 Conference): As chair of the. Division I volleyball committee and on behalf of that committee, I-would like to encourage support of this proposal. The volleyball committee has recognized the need for improvement of officiating as a major priority. The NCAA services in this area are available only to sports for which the NCAA writes its own rules. The establishment of a rules committee is the first step in a series of efforts designed to recognize the increased visibility of the sport of women's volleyball, the intensity of competition and the continued development of conference-related services and volleyball officiating. It would allow the division playing rules to be made by a group within the Association's structure. Your support of Proposal 153 will aid the continued development of this.

very significant sport.

Deborah Chin (University of New Haven): I am chair of the Division II volleyball committee. The Division II committee feels the current rule-making body, the National Association of Girls and Women's Sports, has adequately reflected the rules that our colleges are interested in playing by. Currently, the Divisions I, II and III sports committees make few of the NAGWS rules in use in their championships play. We feel there is no need to create another group to write rules. To state that the rule-making body has not been responsive to the

collegiate games is simply erroneous.

The makeup of the NAGWS rules committee permits the NCAA to have three representatives that sit on the committee. In addition, the chair of the NAGWS rules committee and other members of the committee have annually met for the last three years with all members of the Division I sports committee and the chairs of Divisions II and III. At that time, all NCAA competitive divisions were and are still afforded the opportunity to express concerns and to impact change in the rules.

As the NCAA's representative to the NAGWS rules committee for the past three years, I have personally contacted each division chair to solicit any additional input and concerns that the chairs may have had. It has been my experience that the NAGWS rules committee has implemented all rules and recommendations that the division chairs have recommended, even to the extent of stopping publication of the 1990 rule book to accommodate a change by the Division I sports committee regarding rally point scoring and taking out the rule to rule in the 1991 official rules.

How much more responsive can the rules committee be? Many of our decisions on the previous 152 proposals have been based on cost-reduction and cost-containment. Why should we spend funds to duplicate a process that is meeting the needs of the collegiate women's games? Let's save the estimated \$13,500, send three NCAA representatives to the rules committee, and please defeat Proposal No. 153.

Robertha Abney (Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania): I rise to speak against this proposal. It is clear that the actions of the Association are directed toward cost-containment and reduction. It is unnecessary to establish a committee that would duplicate the present efforts and services that are being offered. Rather than establishing another committee, let's increase our involvement in the existing rules writing process. Therefore, I urge the membership to defeat this

proposal.

Martha Hawthorne (Rice University): On behalf of the Executive Committee, I would like to register our opposition to Proposal No. 153. Fat the December 9 meeting, the NCAA Executive Committee voted to oppose Proposal No. 153. There are two reasons why the committee took this action. First, the Executive Committee has a long-standing policy that playing rules in a sport can only be published if it has been determined that rules are necessary for the conduct of the sport and separate, complete and distinct from any other published rules for that sport. If approved, this legislation would establish a rules committee without first establishing that the rules that this committee would produce would meet that policy.

It is true that other rules-making committees have been established by recent Conventions. However, most of these have been in sports where both championship administration and rules-making responsibilities already existed and for which rules have already been published that meet the Executive Committee's test. The lone exception is

women's basketball for which a special committee was established first to determine the need for separate rules for that sport; only after it was determined that the proposed rules would meet that criteria was a separate women's basketball rules committee established.

The second reason why the Executive Committee is opposed to No. 153 is for financial consideration. The committee is committed to sound fiscal responsibility, doubly so in the current financial climate. There has been no indication that the National Association for Girls and Women in Sports is unresponsive to the wishes of the collegiate community regarding women's volleyball rules or that the NCAA representatives on that rules body have been unsuccessful in adequately addressing the needs of their constituents.

The Executive Committee believes that it would be fiscally irresponsible to establish a women's volleyball committee, which would cost several thousand dollars, without evidence of a need for that committee.

Sandra Vivas (American Volleyball Coaches Association): In the survey of our coaches in November 1991, the coaches are against this proposal and we ask you to defeat it.

[Proposal No. 153 (Page A-180) was defeated.]

Resolution: Biennial Legislative Convention

Brad W. Hovious (University of Texas at El Paso): Before you pu up your paddles, I move Proposal No. 116.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to see the Convention's vote on this particular issue. The way I read it, we could have a chance to make half the rules that we make now by meeting every other year. It would be a chance to slow down the bureaucracy that we keep creating. And as Teddy Roosevelt said, "Less work gives you more time for bear hunting."

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): Madam Chair, as much as I know we have all had a wonderful time here for the last week and the prospect of doing it every year is attractive, I think this is a very important decision. I would rather see us defeat this motion and look at the issue of governance, as this Convention has already, during the next year. The Presidents Commission urges defeat of this resolution.

[Proposal No. 116 (Page A-145) was defeated.]

CLOSING REMARKS

President Sweet: The final comment is, unless anyone else has any other business to bring before the Convention, I would like to express to a you my personal appreciation for the cooperation that has been demonstrated during these meetings. I think that we have had healthy discussions and debates. We have had an opportunity to address important issues, and I personally thank you for the opportunity to preside at these meetings. I now will accept a motion for adjournment

[The meeting was adjourned at 10 a.m.]

Appendix A

86th Annual Convention LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

(Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in statics are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposed amendments shall be effective as indicated; the term "Immediately" means that the legislation, if adopted, becomes effective upon adjournment of the Conevention. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1991-92 NCAA Manual. All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. Only those proposed amendments upon which the 86th annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments to amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 86th ANNUAL CONVENTION

Proposal Numbers	General Topic
1 through 13	Consent Package
14 through 36	Presidents Commission Grouping
37 through 40	Academics
14 through 36 37 through 40 41 through 48 49 through 61 62 through 75	Eligibility
49 through 61	Personnel
62 through 75	Financial Aid
/b through 108	Playing and Practice Seasons
109 through 117 118 through 124 125 through 141 142 through 144	Governance
5, 118 through 124	General
🏂 .125 through 141	Recruiting
142 through 144	Enforcement
145 through 149	Championships
45 through 149 150 through 153	Committees

Consent Package

Proposals 1 through 13 are offered as a "consent package" of amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon with a single vote, requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption inasmuch as the package contains certain dominant provisions.

egislative Proposals	, <i>f</i>	4-1	

NO. 1 ROLL-CALL VOTES

Intent: To permit the NCAA Presidents Commission to identify potential roll-call votes prior to the Convention and to designate during the Convention the roll-call votes that must occur.

A. Constitution: Amend 4.5.3, pages 23-24, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"4.5.3 Duties and Responsibilities. The Presidents Commission is empowered to:

[4.5.3-(a) through 4.5.3-(f) unchanged.]

"(g) Designate Identify, prior to the printing of the notice of any Convention, specific proposals for which a roll-call vote of the eligible voters will may be mandatory required and designate during the Convention the roll-call votes that must occur, and"

[Remainder of 4.5.3 unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend 5.1.4.4, pages 30-31, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.1.4.4 Voting Methods. The methods of voting at an NCAA Convention shall be by voice, paddle, roll call and/or secret ballot, in accordance with the following procedures:

[5.1.4.4-(a) through 5.1.4.4-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Roll Call. Voting by roll call, on issues other than those so designated by the Presidents Commission in accordance with 4.5.3-(g), shall be conducted only when so ordered by a majority of the eligible delegates present and voting, following the making of an undebatable motion to vote in that manner. If both a roll-call vote and a secret ballot are moved on a particular issue, the vote shall be taken first on whether to vote by roll call. Any interim or subsequent vote to amend, postpone, reconsider, refer or table a proposal that has been designated by the Presidents Commission for a roll-call vote during the Convention pursuant to 4.5.3-(g) also must be conducted by roll-call vote."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will permit the Commission to dispense with roll-call voting when it is evident that legislation to which the Commission has attached the potential roll-call voting requirement will be adopted overwhelmingly. It also will permit the Commission to require that identified roll-call votes occur when the Commission concludes such votes are desirable.

Action: Nos. 1 through 13 were adopted as a consent package.

NO. 2 PRESIDENTS COMMISSION COMMITTEES

Intent: To permit the NCAA Presidents Commission to provide for

2 _______1992 Convention Proceedings

the appointment or election, tenure and duties of its internal committees.

Constitution: Amend 4.5.5.6, page 24, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"4.5.5.6 Commission Committees. The Commission may establish internal committees to study and recommend courses of action on any intercollegiate athletics issue. Members of the vanous committees of the Commission shall be elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the Commission's members. The vote may be either written or by voice but may not be made by proxy and shall provide for their appointment or election, tenure and duties."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will give the Presidents Commission more flexibility in the establishment and administration of its internal committees.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 3 DELEGATES WITH VOTING PRIVILEGES

Intent: To specify that each member institution or conference designating both a male and a female as voting or alternate delegates on the Convention Appointment Form shall be allowed to appoint four official institutional delegates and that in all other situations, institutions and conferences shall be limited to no more than three official delegates.

Constitution: Amend 5.1.3, pages 28-29, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.1.3 Convention Delegates

"5.1.3.1 Institutional and Conference Delegates

"5.1.3.1.1 With Voting Privileges. Each active member and each member conference with voting privileges, as specified in 3.3.2.2, shall be entitled to one vote and may be represented by one to four accredited delegates. Institutions and conferences designating both a male and a female as voting or alternate delegates on the Convention Appointment Form shall be allowed to appoint four official institutional delegates. In all other circumstances, institutions shall be limited to not more than three official delegates.

[Remainder of 5.1.3.1 and 5.1.3.2 through 5.1.3.4 unchanged.] "5.1.3.5 Delegate Participation in Conventions and Meetings

"5.1.3.5.1 Active Delegate. Privileges of the floor and the right to active participation in the business proceedings of any annual or special Convention or division legislative meeting of the Association is accorded to the following:

egislative Proposals .	Α-	3
жувшиче r roposais .	 m-	.,

"(a) Any of the *tour* accredited delegates authorized in 5.1.3.1.1 to represent an active member or member conference with voting privileges;"

[Remainder of 5.1.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Women's Athletics).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will encourage more member institutions and member conferences to designate women as accredited voting or alternate delegates at the NCAA Convention.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 4 AMENDMENTS — COST CONSIDERATIONS

Intent: To delete the requirement that sponsors of proposed legislation provide cost estimates to the Association and/or the membership, and to specify that the Council or the Presidents Commission, at its discretion, may require sponsors to provide such information.

Constitution: Amend 5.3.4, page 35, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.3.4 Cost Considerations. The Council or Presidents Commission may require 7the sponsors of each proposed amendment or amendment-to-amendment that, if adopted, would require result in significant expenditures from the Association's budget and/or by member institutions shall to provide, in accordance with the deadline provisions of 5.3.3.1 for amendments and 5.3.3.2 for amendments-to-amendments, written documentation of the estimated costs to the Association and/or the members. The information shall be included with the copy of the proposed amendment mailed to all members in accordance with 5.3.5.1 or 5.3.5.2."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Advisory Committee to Review the NCAA Governance Process).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current requirement regarding the submission of cost considerations with proposed legislation has proven to be unworkable and unfeasible. This proposal will permit the Council and the Presidents Commission to request such cost estimates only when they believe that it is necessary.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 5 MARKETING OF STUDENT-ATHLETES

Intent: To confirm that athletics department staff members are prohibited from representing an individual in the marketing of a student-athlete's athletics ability or reputation to an agent.

Bylaws: Amend 11.1.5, page 50, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"11.1.5 Marketing Student-Athletes to Professional Teams/Organizations. Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution shall not represent, directly or indirectly, any individual in the marketing of athletics ability or reputation to an agent, a professional sports team or a professional sports organization and shall not receive compensation or gratuities of any kind, directly or indirectly, for such services."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: In a recent infractions case, an individual attempted to avoid responsibility for a violation in part by asserting that negotiating on behalf of a student-athlete with an agent would be permissible. This proposal will confirm the established interpretation that such representation is prohibited.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 6 RECRUITING CORRESPONDENCE — MEMBER CONFERENCES

Intent: To prohibit Divisions I and II member conferences from corresponding with prospective student-athletes for purposes of recruitment.

Bylaws: Amend 13.4.1, pages 98-99, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Permissible Items. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the following printed materials to prospects and to high-school and two-year college coaches:

[13.4.1-(a) through 13.4.1-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) General correspondence, including letters and regular (not specialized) cards that do not include pictures of the institution's department of athletics personnel or enrolled student-athletes, except that correspondence from member conferences for purposes of recruitment is prohibited. In Division I only, institutional stationery is limited to one color of printing on the stationery (not including the color of the typing or writing on such stationery). Such stationery may include athletics department stationery with name, address, telephone number(s) of athletics department staff members and a single university logo, but photographs of enrollment student-athletes or any other promotional material is prohibited;"

[Remainder of 13.4.1 unchanged.]

Legislative	Proposal.	c

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will reduce recruiting pressures on prospective student-athletes and help to ensure that member conferences do not become involved in the potentially costly activity of corresponding with prospective student-athletes for purposes of recruitment.

Action: See No. 1.

EXPENSES FOR OUTSIDE COMPETITION NO. 7

Intent: To specify that a member institution shall not provide expenses to a student-athlete to attend bona fide amateur competition during the Christmas and spring vacation periods while not representing the institution.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.02.6.1, page 119, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote] "14.02.6.1 Exempted Events. Participation in events listed in 16.8.1.3-(a) through (c) and (b) is exempted from the application of this legislation."

B. Bylaws: Amend 16.8.1.3, page 190, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote] "16.8.1.3 Other Competition. An institution may provide actual and necessary expenses related to participation in the following

activities: [16.8.1.3-(a) and 16.8.1.3-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Bona fide amateur competition during the Christmas and spring vacation periods, as listed in the institution's official calendar,"

[16.8.1.3-(d) and 16.8.1.3-(e), relettered as 16.8.1.3-(c) and 16.8.1.3-(d), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will specify that student-athletes will use a season of competition if they receive actual and necessary expenses from a member institution related to participation in bona fide amateur competition during vacation time.

Action: See No. 1.

SATISFACTORY PROGRESS—NONRECRUITED, NONPARTICIPANT EXCEPTION NO.8

Intent: To permit student-athletes who have participated only in limited preseason tryouts to utilize the nonrecruited, nonparticipant exception to the satisfactory-progress rule.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4, page 140, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote] "14.5.4 Exceptions to Satisfactory-Progress Rule

1992 Convention Proceeding

[14.5.4-(a) and 14.5.4-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Nonrecruited, nonparticipant — A student-athlete may qualify for a waiver of the application of the satisfactoryprogress regulation for the initial season of eligibility if the student has been in residence at the certifying institution for more than one academic year; was not recruited; has not received athletically related financial assistance; has never practiced or participated in intercollegiate athletics, except that a student may have participated in limited preseason tryouts, and is otherwise eligible under all institutional, conference and NCAA rules. The student-athlete's eligibility in subsequent seasons would be governed by the provisions of the satisfactory-progress rule (see 14.5.2). which would be applied from the beginning of the first term the student began participation."

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal extends the nonrecruited, nonparticipant exception to the satisfactory-progress rule to those student-athletes who have participated only in limited preseason tryouts. The scope of the proposal is limited, and it will not compromise the basis of the Association's continuing-eligibility legislation.

Action: See No. 1.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT — TWO-YEAR NO. 9 COLLEGE TRANSFERS

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete admitted after the 12th class day may not utilize that semester or quarter for the purpose of fulfilling the residence component of the two-year college transfer requirements.

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.4, pages 143-146, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.6.4 Two-Year College Transfers, A student who transfers to a Division I or II member institution from a two-year college or from a branch school that conducts an intercollegiate athletics program must complete an academic year of residence unless the student meets the following eligibility requirements applicable to the division of which the certifying institution is a member. Further, a transfer student-athlete admitted after the 12th class day may not utilize that semester or quarter for the purpose of establishing residency."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This rule currently applies to four-year college transfer students. The Academic Requirements Committee believes that the lack of this rule in the two-year college transfer context is a

Legislative Proposals	Α-'
	• •

loophole that should be eliminated.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 10 TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY — EXCHANGE STUDENT EXCEPTION

Intent: To permit student-athletes transferring to a Division III in-stitution to utilize the exchange student exception to the transfer residence requirement, provided a formal exchange program exists between the two involved member institutions.

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.5.3.2, page 148, as follows: [Division III only]

"14.6.5.3.2 Exchange Student Exception. The student is enrolled in the certifying institution for a specified period of time as a bona fide exchange student participating in a formal educational exchange program that is an established requirement of the student-athlete's curriculum."

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will provide an exception to the transfer. residence requirement for exchange students at Division III member institutions, provided a formal exchange program exists between the two involved institutions. This exception currently exists in Divisions I and II. It is permissive legislation, limited in scope, and will not compromise the intent of the transfer residence requirement.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 11 BOWL-GAME AWARDS

Intent: To permit student-athletes to receive awards valued at no more than \$300 from sponsoring agencies for participation in certified postseason bowl games, and to apply this awards limitation separately from other awards restrictions related to bowl games.

Bylaws: Amend 16.1.4.2, page 182, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.1.4.2 Special Events and Bowls. Awards for participation in special events (such as postseason football games, NCAA championships and other established meets and tournaments, all-star games, featured individual competition) and established regional or national recognition awards (e.g., Wade Trophy, Heisman Trophy) may be presented only by the management of such an event or awards program or by an institution that has had or will have a team or individual participate in that event.

"16.1.4.2.1 Number and Value of Awards. The total value of any single award to any one student-athlete for a special event may not exceed \$300, except awards presented by the 1992 Convention Proceedings

Association to student-athletes for participation in NCAA championship events per 16.1.4.2.2 and for most-valuable-player awards per 16.1.4.2.3. Multiple awards may be presented only by the institution and the management of the event if the total value of all awards presented for participation in the meet (e.g., a multievent winner in a gymnastics or track and field meet) or in honor of the student-athlete's achievement does not exceed \$300, except for bowl-game awards per 16.1.4.2.4.

[16.1.4.2.2 and 16.1.4.2.3 unchanged.]

"16.1.4.2.4 Bowl-Game Awards. Awards presented to student-athletes from the sponsoring agency of a certified postseason bowl game shall not exceed \$300 in value. The value of additional awards presented by an institution to its student-athletes for bowl-game participation shall be subject to a separate \$300 limitation."

[16.1.4.2.4 renumbered as 16.1.4.2.5, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Special Events Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will make bowl-game awards more consistent with the awards received by student-athletes who participate in NCAA championships.

"Action: See No. 1.

NO. 12 TRAVEL EXPENSES — EXEMPTED PRESEASON FOOTBALL GAMES

Intent: To specify that travel expense restrictions do not apply to travel prior to the National Football Foundation Hall of Fame benefit game or the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game

A. Bylaws: Amend 16.7.1.1, page 189, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16 7.1.1 Exceptions. The time limitations related to the provisions of travel expenses do not apply in the following circumstances:

[16.7.1.1-(a) through 16.7.1.1-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Travel prior to the National Football Foundation Hall of Fame benefit game or the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game."

B. Bylaws: Amend 16.8 1.2.1.1, page 190, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.8.1.2.1.1 Exceptions. These travel expense restrictions do not apply in the following circumstances:

[16.8.1.2.1.1-(a) through 16.8.1.2.1.1-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Travel prior to the National Football Foundation Hall

gislative Proposals	A	\-9

of Fame benefit game or the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game."

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will permit student-athletes who participate in the Kickoff Classic and the Pigskin Classic to participate in traditional pregame activities such as the pregame banquet, even though classes have started.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 13 FALL PRESEASON PRACTICE OPPORTUNITIES

Intent: To exempt days during the preseason when all institutional dormitories are closed and the institution's team must leave campus and practice is not conducted from counting toward the permissible number of preseason practice opportunities in that sport.

Bylaws: Amend 17.02.13, page 201, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.02.13 Practice Opportunities. In determining the number of practice opportunities to establish the starting date for preseason practice, there shall be counted one for each day beginning with the opening of classes, one for each day classes are not in session in the week of the first scheduled intercollegiate contest and two for each other day in the preseason practice period, except that the institution shall not count any days during the preseason when all institutional dormitories are closed and the institution's team must leave campus and practice is not conducted."

[Remainder of 17.02.13 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will permit member institutions to exempt days during the preseason when all institutional dormitories are closed and student-athletes have departed campus from counting toward the permissible number of preseason practice opportunities.

Action: See No. 1.

Presidents Commission Grouping

[Note: The Presidents Commission designated the following 23 proposals for placement at this point in the agenda Please note that inclusion of a proposal in this grouping does not constitute a position by the Commission for or against the proposal; rather, the proposals are placed here because the Commission believes that they are of particular interest to chief executive officers. The only proposals officially

A-10 _______1992 Convention Proceedings

sponsored by the Commission are identified with an asterisk before the proposal number. Please note also that the Commission designated all 23 proposals in this grouping for roll-call votes.

* NO. 14 CORE-CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS

Intent. To increase from 11 to 13 the minimum number of corecourse credits for a qualifier and to require that the two additional core-course credits be earned in English, mathematics or natural or physical science.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1, pages 127-129, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.3.1.1 Qualifier, Basic Requirements. A qualifier is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following academic qualifications:

"(a) A minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 13 academic courses, including at least the following:

"English 3 years
"Mathematics 2 years
"Social science 2 years
"Natural or physical science 2 years

(including at least one laboratory course, if offered by the high school)

"Additional courses in English, 2 years mathematics or natural or physical science

"The record of the above courses and course grades must be certified on the high-school transcript or by official correspondence, and

[14.3.1.1-(b) unchanged.]

"14.3.1.1.1 Core-Curriculum Requirements. For purposes of meeting the core-curriculum requirement to establish eligibility at a Division I or II member institution, a 'core course' is defined as a recognized academic course (as opposed to a vocational or personal-service course) that offers fundamental instructional components in a specified area of study. Courses that are taught at a level below the high school's regular academic instructional level (e.g., remedial, special education or compensatory) shall not be considered core courses regardless of course content. Effective with courses taken during the 1987-88 academic year and thereafter, at least 75 percent of the instructional content of a course must be in one or more of the required areas [as listed in (a) through (e) (f) below], and 'statistics,' as referred to in the mathematics section, must be advanced (algebra-based). For courses taken during and prior to the 1986-87 academic year to be considered core courses, at least some instructional elements (as listed below) must be included.

egislative.	Proposals	
-------------	-----------	--

[14.3.1.1.1-(a) through 14.3.1.1.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Additional Courses in English, Mathematics or Natural or Physical Science - (two years required). Two years of additional academic credit must be from courses in the above areas of English, mathematics or natural or physical science.

[14.3.1.1.1-(e), relettered as 14.3.1.1.1-(f), and 14.3.1.1.1.1 through 14.3.1.1.1.5 unchanged.]

"14.3.1.1.1.6 Grade Value of Core Courses. The following grade values are to be used in determining a student's grade-point average in the core courses: A = 4 quality points, B = 3 quality points, C = 2 quality points, D = 1 quality point. In determining the core-curriculum grade-point average, each grade earned in a course (including all numerical grades) must be converted to this 4.000 scale on an individual-course basis. Pluses or minuses within a grade level shall not receive greater or lesser quality points. A school's normal practice of weighting honors or advanced courses may be used to compute the quality points awarded in those courses and the cumulative grade-point average, provided a written statement verifying the grading policy accompanies the prospective student-athlete's official grade transcript. The core-curriculum grade-point average may be calculated using the student's 11 13 best grades from courses that meet the distribution requirements of the core curriculum. Additional core courses (beyond the 11 13 required) may be used to meet the core-curriculum grade-point average, provided the distribution requirements are met."

[Remainder of 14.3.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee); NCAA Presidents Commission; all nine members of the Atlantic Coast Conference, all 11 members of the Big Ten Conference, all nine members of the Mid-American Athletic Conference and all 11 members of Southeastern Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1995; for those student-athletes first entering collegiate institutions on or after August 1, 1995.

Rationale: This proposal increases initial-eligibility standards in an effort to enhance the academic preparedness of high-school student-athletes prior to enrollment in a Division I or II member institution. This proposal will encourage prospects to take a broader curriculum of high-school courses by placing greater emphasis on the use of core courses to meet NCAA initial-eligibility standards.

Action: Adopted by Division I (312-6, one abstention); roll-call vote; adopted by Division II (164-26), roll-call vote.

	1992 Convention Proceedings
12	

NO. 15 CORE-CURRICULUM GRADE-POINT AVERAGE

Intent: To increase the minimum cumulative core-curriculum gradepoint average for a qualifier in Division I from 2.000 to 2.500, and to increase the minimum cumulative high-school gradepoint average for a partial qualifier in Division I from 2.000 to

Bylaws: Amend 14.02.9.2, page 119, as follows: [Division I only, roll call]

"14.02.9.2 Partial Qualifier — Division I. In Division I, a partial qualifier is a student who does not meet the requirements for a qualifier but who, at the time of graduation from high school, presents a cumulative grade-point average of at least 2.000 2.500 (based upon a 4.000 scale)."

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1, pages 127-129, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.1.1 Qualifier, Basic Requirements. A qualifier is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following academic qualifications:

"(a) A minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.500 in Division I and in Division II 2,000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses, including at least the following:

"English 3 years "Mathematics 2 years "Social Science 2 years "Natural or physical science 2 years (including at least one laboratory

course, if offered by the high school)

"The record of the above courses and course grades must be certified on the high-school transcript or by official correspondence, and"

[Remainder of 14.3.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee) and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: August 1, 1995; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1995.

Rationale: Based on available research, the current initial-eligibility rule underemphasizes a prospect's core-curriculum gradepoint averages. Increasing the minimum core-curriculum gradepoint average to 2.500 will make the grade-point average standard consistent with the test-score standard and further increase the academic preparation of and the chance of academic success for prospective student-athletes.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No. 16.

Legislative Proposals A	\-13
-------------------------	-------------

NO. 16 INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY INDEX

Intent: To establish an initial-eligibility index in Division I based upon a core-curriculum grade-point average of 2.500, an SAT score of 700 and an ACT score of 17 to limit the index to present test-score and core-curriculum boundaries, and to increase the minimum cumulative high-school grade-point average for a partial qualifier in Division I from 2.000 to 2.500.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.02.9.2, page 119, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.02.9.2 Partial Qualifier — Division I. In Division I, a partial qualifier is a student who does not meet the requirements for a qualifier but who, at the time of graduation from high school, presents a cumulative grade-point average of at least 2.000 2.500 (based on a 4.000 scale)."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1, pages 127-129, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.1.1 Qualifier, Basic Requirements. A qualifier is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following academic qualifications:

"(a) A minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.000, as specified in 14.3.1.1.1 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses, including at least the following:

[Remainder of 14.3.1.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) A minimum 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections, or a minimum composite score on the ACT of 15 (if taken prior to October 28, 1989) or 18 (if taken on or subsequent to October 28, 1989) as specified in 14.3.1.1.1. The required SAT or ACT score must be achieved under national testing conditions on a national testing date [i.e., no residual (campus) testing or regional testing dates].

"14.3.1.1.1 Initial-Eligibility Index. Freshmen may establish eligibility using the following eligibility index:

"CIDA	SAT	ACT
"GPA	700	17
"2.500	•	18
2.375	750	
2.250	800	19
2.125	850	20
	900	21"
2 000	200	

[14.3.1.1.1 through 14.3.1.1.5, renumbered as 14.3.1.1.2 through 14.3.1.1.6, unchanged.)

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee) and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: August 1, 1995; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1995.

Rationale: Research indicates that an equally weighted average of a

1992 Convention Proceedings

student's core-curriculum grade-point average and standardized test score predicts a student's academic success in college (i.e., graduation) better than alternative initial-eligibility variables: therefore, the Council and Presidents Commission recommend that an initial-eligibility index be established, the parameters of which do not go below the current minimum standards of 2.000 on the core-curriculum grade-point average and a combined score of 700 on the SAT or a composite score of 17 on the ACT.

Action: Adopted by Division I (249-72, five abstentions), roll-call vote. Motion to refer to the Academic Requirements Committee was defeated (55-263, two abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 17 INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — QUALIFIER

Intent: To change the academic requirements for initial freshman eligibility by utilizing a sliding scale based on standardized test score, number of core courses completed and core-curriculum grade-point average.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1, pages 127-129, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.3.1.1 Qualifier, Basic Requirements. A qualifier is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following academic qualifications:

[14.3.1.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) A minimum of 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections, or a minimum composite score on the ACT of 15 (if taken prior to October 28, 1989) or 18 (if taken on or subsequent to October 28, 1989) as specified below. The required SAT or ACT score must be achieved under national testing conditions on a national testing date [i.e., no residual (campus) testing or regional testing dates].

		"Nu	mber of	core co	courses			
"SAT	ACT	11	12	13	14			
"800 and above	19	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000			
700-799	17-18	2.100	2.000	2.000	2.000			
650-699	16	2.200	2.100	2.000	2.000			
600-649	15	2.300	2.200	2.100	2.000°			

[Remainder of 14.3.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: All 10 members of the Big East Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The membership has expressed a desire to place more emphasis on the core curriculum for initial eligibility. The initial findings of the NCAA Research Committee are that "the research does not support the limitations of 'cut-off scores' within the index" as an accurate predictor of college performance; the better predictors of college achievement are the high-school grade-point average, rank in class and core courses. In addition,

egislative Proposals	A	-1	4

there has been concern for the gender, ethnic and socioeconomic in the same secondary of the gender, ethnic and socioeconomic in the same secondary of the range and sliding scale places greater emphasis on the core cur riculum and core-curriculum grade-point average.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 17-1 INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — QUALIFIER

Intent: To delete the opportunity for a prospective student-athlete to a utilize an SAT score of 600 to 649 or an ACT score of 15 to fulfill. the Association's initial-eligibility requirements.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 17-1, 14.3.1.1, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]-

"14.3.1.1 Qualifier, Basic Requirements. A qualifier is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following academic qualifications:

[14.3.1.1-(a) unchanged.l

"(b) A minimum combined score on the SAT verbal and math. sections, or a minimum composite score on the ACT as specified below. The required SAT or ACT score must be achieved under national testing conditions on a national testing date [i.e., no residual (campus) testing or regional % testing dates].

testing dates).		"Nur	nber of o	ore cour	ses
"SAT" "800 and above 700-799 650-699	ACT 19 17-18 16	11 2.000 2.100 2.200 2.300	12 2.000 2.000 2.100 2.200	13 2.000 2.000 2.000 2.100	14 2.000 2.000 2.000 2.000

[Remainder of 14.3.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: All 10 members of the Big East Conference.

Rationale: The sponsors believe there are member institutions that are troubled by the perception of SAT/ACT scores in the lower range of Proposal No. 17.

Action: Moot due to withdrawal of No. 1.

NO. 17-2 INITIAL ELIGIBILITY

[Note: Upon the recommendation of the parliamentarian, the ... chair intends to rule amendment-to-amendment No. 17-2 out of order. The sponsors have asked that the proposal be circulated in order to challenge the chair's ruling.]

Intent: To delete the standardized test-score component of the Association's initial-eligibility legislation.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 17, 14.3.1.1, as follows: [Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

1992 Convention Proceedings 3

s. "14.3.1.1 Qualifier, Basic Requirements. A qualifier is defined as

"(b) A minimum combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections, or a minimum composite score on the ACT as specified below. The required SAT or ACT score must be achieved under national testing conditions on a national testing date (i.e., no residual (campus) testing or regional testing dates).

(campus) les	"Ni	mber of	core cour	ses
ACT 19 17-18 16 15	2.000 2.100 2.200 2.300	12 2.000 2.000 2 100 2.200	13 2.000 2 000 2 000 2.100	14 2.000 2.000 2.000 2.000
	ACT 19 17-18 16	ACT 11 19 2.000 17-18 2.100 16 2.200	ACT 11 12 19 2.000 2.000 17-18 2.100 2.000 16 2.200 2.100 2.200 2.200 2.200	19 2.000 2.000 2.000 17-18 2.100 2.000 2.000 16 2.200 2.100 2.000 16 2.200 2.100 2.100

[Remainder of 14.3.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: All 10 members of the Big East Conference

Rationale: Sufficient evidence exists to indicate that the Association is misusing standardized test scores in establishing initial eligibility. A more accurate measure of a prospective student-athlete's academic success can be achieved by relying on increased core-course requirements.

Action: Moot due to withdrawal of No. 17.

OFFICIAL VISIT PRIOR TO EARLY SIGNING PERIOD

Intent: To prohibit a prospective student-athlete in Division I sports with early National Letter of Intent signing periods (i.e., in all sports other than football, women's volleyball, field hockey, soccer and water polo) from receiving an official visit prior to the early signing date in that sport if the prospect does not present a minimum SAT score of 700 or ACT score of 17 and does not present a minimum 2 000 grade-point average in at least seven core courses, and to specify that prospects who do not meet these requirements shall not receive an official visit until at least 24 hours following the end of the early signing period.

Bylaws: Amend 13.7.1.2 by adding new 13.7.1.2.4, page 102, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"13.7.1.2.4 Academic Credentials for Official Visit Prior to Early Signing Period. A Division I member institution may not provide an expense-paid visit to a prospective student-athlete in a sport that has an early signing period for the National Letter of Intent prior to the initial early signing date in that sport if the prospect has not presented the institution with a minimum combined SAT score of 700 or a minimum composite ACT score of 17, and also has presented a minimum 2.000 grade-point average in at least seven core courses (per 14.3.1.1.1). A prospective stu-

•	A	17
_ ,		7-1/
egislative Proposals		

dent-athlete in the applicable sports who does not present these academic credentials shall not begin an official visit until 24 hours after the last day of the early signing period in that sport."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: This proposal will provide an incentive to prospective student-athletes to achieve academic credentials by the begin-: ning of the senior year of high school that will give them a reasonable chance to become qualifiers prior to their receipt of an official visit. It also will permit member institutions to allocate recruiting funds more efficiently by establishing a more complete academic profile of prospective student-athletes who might, sign a National Letter of Intent during the early signing period.

Action: Adopted by Division I (249-74, two abstentions), roll-callvote, as amended by No. 18-1.

NO. 18-1 OFFICIAL VISIT PRIOR TO EARLY SIGNING PERIOD

Intent: To delay the effective date of Proposal No. 18 by one year? until August 1, 1993.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 18, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"Effective Date: August 1, 1992 August 1, 1993."

Source: NCAA Council; all 11 members of the Big West Conference; all nine members of the Western Athletic Conference; Auburn & University; Clemson University; University of Georgia; Georgia Institute of Technology; University of Notre Dame, and University sity of Pittsburgh.

Rationale: Delaying the effective date of this proposal until August 1, 1993, will allow adequate time for prospective student-athletes who are potential early National Letter of Intent signees to adjust their academic plans to the new requirements.

Action: Adopted by Division I (288-34, two abstentions), roll-call vote.

SATISFACTORY PROGRESS — MID-YEAR NO. 19 TRANSFER STUDENTS

Intent: To require a mid-year transfer student (either a two-year or a four-year college transfer) in Divisions I and II to be certified for satisfactory-progress purposes at the beginning of the next fall term, even if the student-athlete did not compete during the spring term.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.2, pages 137-138, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call] "14.5.2 Eligibility for Competition. Eligibility for competition for

1992 Convention Proceedings A-18 _

a mid-year transfer student-athlete, for a student-athlete subsequent to the first academic year in residence or for a student-athlete after that student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in any sport at the certifying institution shall be determined by the student-athlete's academic record in existence at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year, based upon:"

[Remainder of 14.5 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee) and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: Immediately; for those student-athletes first entering the certifying institution during the 1991-92 academic year and thereafter.

Rationale: The current rule indicates that student-athletes must be certified for satisfactory-progress purposes when they either have utilized a season of competition at the institution or have spent an academic year in residence at the institution; therefore, a mid-year transfer in the sport of football, for instance, would not have to be certified for satisfactory-progress purposes at the beginning of the next fall term because, at that time, he neither would have utilized a season of competition nor would he have spent an academic year in residence at the institution. The proposed change would require the student-athlete to be certified at the beginning of the next fall term (after transferring to the institution) in order to be eligible during that term.

Action: Adopted by Division I (316-11, one abstention) and by Division II (186-4), roll-call votes.

NO. 20 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS — REGULAR ACADEMIC YEAR

Intent: To specify that 75 percent of the semester or credit hours used by a student-athlete to fulfill satisfactory-progress requirements must be earned during the regular academic year and that the student-athlete shall earn no more than 25 percent of the semester or quarter hours used to meet satisfactory-progress requirements during the summer.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.2 by adding new 14.5.2.1, page 137, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.5.2.1 Regular Academic Year. The student-athlete shall earn at least 75 percent of the semester or quarter hours required for satisfactory progress during the regular academic year. The student-athlete shall earn no more than 25 percent of the semester or quarter hours required for satisfactory progress during the summer."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee) and NCAA Presidents Commission.

egislative Proposals	A-19

- Effective Date: August 1, 1992 (for credit hours earned during the 1992-93 academic year and thereafter).
- Rationale: The Council and Presidents Commission believe that this proposal will emphasize academic achievement during the regular academic year and will place less emphasis on summer school as an academic panacea for eligibility.
- Action: Adopted by Division I (260-66, one abstention), roll-call vote, and by Division II (149-39), roll-call vote, as amended by No. 20-1.

NO. 20-1 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS — REGULAR ACADEMIC YEAR

Intent: To establish a waiver procedure related to the requirement that 75 percent of the credit hours used by a student-athlete to fulfill satisfactory-progress requirements must be earned during the regular academic year.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 20, 14.5.2.1, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call] "14.5.2.1 Waiver Procedures. The NCAA Academic Requirements Committee shall have the authority to authority rize waivers of this requirement based upon objective evidence that demonstrates circumstances in which a student's overall academic record warrants the waiver of the normal application of this regulation. The committee shall establish the process for granting such waivers and shall report at least annually to the NČAA Council and tothe membership the actions taken in summary aggregate form."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Adopted by Division I (312-13) and by Division II (184-9, one abstention), roll-call votes.

- NO. 21 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS FULFILLMENT OF DEGREE REQUIREMENTS AND MINIMUM, GRADE-POINT AVERAGE
- Intent: To specify that a student-athlete in Division I or II must have completed successfully a minimum percentage of course requirements in the student's specific degree program to be eligible for competition; to specify that a Division I student-athlete must present a minimum grade-point average based upon a percentage of the institution's cumulative minimum grade-point average requirement for graduation to be eligible for competition, and to establish a waiver procedure related to the application of the degree and grade-point average requirements in both divisions.
- A. Bylaws: Amend 14.5, pages 136-140, as follows: [Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call] "14.5 SATISFACTORY-PROGRESS REQUIREMENTS — DIVI-SIONS I AND II _ 1992 Convention Proceedings *.

"A student-athlete who has completed at least one academic year in residence or utilized one season of eligibility in a sport at the certifying institution shall be required to satisfy minimum academic progress requirements for eligibility for financial aid, practice and competition. The restrictions, exceptions and waivers applicable to the general requirements for good academic standing and satisfactory progress (per 14.4.3) apply also to the following additional satisfactory-progress requirements for student-athletes in Divisions I and II.

[14.5.1 unchanged.]

"14.5.2 Fulfillment of Degree Requirements. As a prerequisite for eligibility for competition, a student-athlete shall have completed successfully the course requirements in the student's specific degree program specified below. This provision shall be applicable to the eligibility not only of a continuing student, but also of a transfer student from a two-year or four-year collegiate institution, even if the student has not yet completed an academic year in residence or utilized a season of eligibility in a sport at the certifying institution.

"14.5.2.1 Percent of Degree Requirements. A studentathlete who is entering his or her third year of collegiate enrollment shall have completed successfully at least 25 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific degree program. A student-athlete who is entering his or her fourth year of collegiate enrollment shall have completed successfully at least 50 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific degree program. A student-athlete who is entering his or her fifth year of collegiate enrollment shall have completed successfully at least 75 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific degree program.

"14.5.2.2 Waiver Procedures. The NCAA Academic Requirements Committee shall have the authority to authorize waivers of the degree-requirement provisions of this legislation based upon objective evidence that demonstrates circumstances in which a student's overall academic record warrants the waiver of the normal application of this regulation. The committee shall establish the process for granting such waivers and shall report at least annually to the NCAA Council and to the membership the actions taken in summary aggregate form.

"14.5.2 14.5.3 Additional Eligibility Requirements for Competition. Eligibility for competition, subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in any sport at the certifying institution shall be determined by the student-athlete's academic record in existence at the beginning of the fall

: Legislative Proposals _____

term of the regular academic year, based upon: [14.5.2-(a), 14.5.2-(b), 14.5.2.1 and 14.5.2.2, renumbered as 14.5.3-(a), 14.5.3-(b), 14.5.3.1 and 14.5.3.2 unchanged.]

"14.5 2.3 Fulfillment of Degree Requirements. A student-athlete who is entering his of her fourth or subsequent year of collegiate enrollment shall have completed successfully at least 50 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific degree crogram as a prerequisite for further eligibility. This provision shall be applicable to the efgibility not only of a continuing student, but also of a transfer student from a two-year or four-year collegiate institution who is entering his or her fourth year of collegiate enrollment, even if the student has not yet completed an academic year in residence or utilized a season of eligibility in a sport at the certifying institution."

[14.5.3 through 14.5.5, renumbered as 14.5.4 through 14.5.6, un. changed.]

Action: Part A adopted by Division I (270-48, one abstention) and defeated by Division II (57-134, three abstentions), roll-calling

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.5, pages 136-140, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.5 SATISFACTORY-PROGRESS REQUIREMENTS — DIVI SIONS I AND II

"A student-athlete who has completed at least one academic" year in residence or utilized one season of eligibility in a sport ati the certifying institution shall be required to satisfy the minimum academic progress requirements for eligibility for financial aid, practice and competition. The restrictions, exceptions and waivers applicable to the general requirements for good academic standing and satisfactory progress (per 14.4.3) apply also to the following additional satisfactory-progress requirements for student-athletes in Divisions I and II.

[14.5.1 unchanged.]

"14.5.2 Fulfillment of Minimum Grade-Point Average Requirements — Division I. As a prerequisite for eligibility for competition, a Division I student-athlete shall present the minimum grade-point average specified below, com. puted pursuant to institutional policies applicable to all students. This provision shall be applicable to the eligibility not only of a continuing student, but also of a transfer student from a two-year or four-year collegiate institution, even if the student has not yet completed an academic year in residence or utilized a season of eligibil. ity in a sport at the certifying institution.

"14.5.2.1 Minimum Grade-Point Average. A student athlete who is entering his or her third year of collegiate enrollment shall present a cumulative minimum grade-point average (based upon a maximum of 4.000) that equals at least 95 percent of the cumulative minimum grade-point average required for graduation. A student-athlete who is entering his or her fourth or

subsequent year of collegiate enrollment shall present a cumulative minimum grade-point average (based upon a maximum of 4.000) that equals 100 percent of the cumulative minimum grade-point average required for graduation.

"14.5.2.2 Waiver Procedures. The NCAA Academic Requirements Committee shall have the authority to authorize waivers of the grade-point average provisions of this legislation based upon objective evidence that demonstrates circumstances in which a student's overall academic record warrants the waiver of the normal application of this regulation. The committee shall establish the process for granting such waivers and shall report at least annually to the NCAA Council and to the membership the actions taken in summary aggregate form.

"14 5.2 14.5.3 Additional Eligibility Requirements for Competition. Eligibility for competition, subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in any sport at the certifying institution shall be determined by the student-athlete's academic record in existence at the beginning of the fall in term of the regular academic year, based upon:"

[14.5.2-(a), 14.5.2-(b), 14.5.2.1 through 14.5.2.3, and 14.5.3 through 14.5.5, renumbered as 14.5.3-(a), 14.5.3-(b), 14.5.3.1 through 14.5.3.3, and 14.5.4 through 14.5.6, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee) and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992; for student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1992.

Rationale. During the 1991 NCAA Convention, the Association adopted legislation to require a student-athlete to have completed at least 50 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific degree program by the beginning of the fourth year of collegiate enrollment — this proposal would expand such a requirement to the third and fifth years. Such legislation will help ensure that student-athletes meeting these requirements will, in fact, receive a degree. It is important to note that this legislation would apply not only to continuing students but also to transfer students (from either two-year or four-year colleges) entering their third, fourth or fifth year of collegiate enrollment. This proposal also would require student-athletes entering their third and subsequent years of collegiate enrollment to earn a cumulative minimum grade-point average that is based upon a percentage of the cumulative minimum grade-point average required for graduation at that institution. The computation of the student-athlete's grade-point average would be based upon institutional policies applicable to all students. The Council and Presidents Commission believe that this proposal recognizes the importance of the establishment of a minimum grade-point average as a component of the Association's continuing-eligibility requirements, while retaining institutional autonomy.

Action: Part B adopted by Division I (275-38, two abstentions), rollcall vote, as amended by No. 21-1.

NO. 21-1 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS — FULFILLMENT OF DEGREE REQUIREMENTS AND MINIMUM GRADE-POINT AVERAGE

Intent: To alter the minimum grade-point averages required for continuing eligibility from 95 to 90 percent of the cumulative minimum grade-point average required for graduation for a studentathlete who is entering the third year of collegiate enrollment and from 100 to 95 percent of the cumulative minimum gradepoint average required for graduation for a student-athlete who is entering the fourth or subsequent year of collegiate enroll-

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 21-B, 14.5.2.1, as follows: [Division I only, roll call]

"14.5.2.1 Minimum Grade-Point Average. A student-athlete who is entering his or her third year of collegiate enrollment shall present a cumulative minimum grade-point average (based upon a maximum of 4,000) that equals at least 95 90 percent of the cumulative minimum grade-point average required for graduation. A student-athlete who is entering his or her fourth or subsequent year of collegiate enrollment shall present a cumulative minimum grade-point average (based upon a maximum of 4.000) that equals 100 95 percent of the cumulative minimum gradepoint average required for graduation."

Source: All eight members of the Patriot League.

Rationale: The limits established in this amendment-to-amendment. are especially appropriate for student-athletes involved in demanding fields of study and will permit student-athletes to mature academically as they complete core academic-curriculum resi quirements and begin to pursue elective curricula, in which they typically excel, to meet graduation requirements.

Action: Adopted by Division I (214-108), roll-call vote.

NO. 22 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS - MINIMUM GRADE-POINT AVERAGE

Intent: To further define satisfactory progress at Division I member institutions as the achievement of a 1.800 grade-point average during each term of the first and second years of enrollment, and a 2.000 grade-point average during each term of the third, fourth and fifth years of enrollment.

bering subsequent sections, as follows:

1992 Convention Proceedings Legislative Proposals _

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.5.2.1.2 Division I. To fulfill the 'satisfactory-completion' provision of this requirement, a student-athlete who first enters a Division I institution subsequent to the 1991-92 academic year must achieve the following cumulative minimum grade-point average (based on a maximum of 4.000) in grades earned at the certifying institu-

- "(a) During each term of the first year of enrollment:
- "(b) During each term of the second year of enrollment:
- "(c) During each term of the third year of enrollment:
- "(d) During each term of the fourth year of enrollment:
- "(e) During each term of the fifth year of enrollment: 2.000.

"14.5.2.1.2.1 Calculation of Grade-Point Average. Calculation of the grade-point average used to fulfill the satisfactory-completion provision of this requirement shall be based on the method used by the institution for all students and shall include all course work taken at the certifying institution and normally counted by the institution in such calculation.

"14.5.2.1.2.2 Calculation of Year of Enrollment. Calculation of the year of enrollment shall be based on the provisions of the five-year rule set forth in 14.2.1."

Source: Ball State University, Bowling Green State University, Central Michigan State University, Kent State University, University of Miami (Ohio), Ohio University, University of Toledo and Western Michigan University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The current satisfactory-progress rule does not contain a qualitative-progress requirement. This proposal would correct that flaw and would assure that credit hours will be earned with a grade-point average that will place the student-athlete in a position to graduate.

Action: Withdrawn.

5. PS NO. 23 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS — MINIMUM GRADE-POINT AVERAGE

*Intent: To further define satisfactory progress at Division I member fourth and fifth years of enrollment.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.2.1 by adding new 14.5.2.1.2, page 137, renum: after the student-athlete has earned 48 semester or 72 quarter hours countable toward satisfactory progress, a 1.800 grade-

- 4	$\gamma \leq$
 	-23

point average after the student-athlete has earned 72 semester or 108 quarter hours, and a 1.900 grade-point average after the student-athlete has earned 96 semester or 144 quarter hours.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.2.1 by adding new 14.5.2.1.2, page 137, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

- "14.5.2.1.2 Division I. To fulfill the 'satisfactory-completion' provision of this requirement, the student-athlete who first enters a Division I institution subsequent to the 1991-92 academic year must achieve the following cumulative minimum grade-point average (based on a maximum of 4.000):
- "(a) After the student-athlete has earned 48 semester or 72 quarter hours countable toward satisfactory progress at the certifying institution: 1.700.
- "(b) After the student-athlete has earned 72 semester or 108 quarter hours countable toward satisfactory progress at the certifying institution: 1.800.
- "(c) After the student-athlete has earned 96 semester or 144 quarter hours countable toward satisfactory progress at the certifying institution: 1.900.
 - "14.5.2.1.2.1 Computation of Grade-Point Average. Computation of the grade-point average used to fulfill the 'satisfactory-completion' provision of this requirement shall be computed by the institution in the same manner it computes cumulative grade-point averages for all students on a term-by-term basis.
 - "14.5.2.1.2.2 Timing of Certification. The grade-point average requirement must be met at the time the student-athlete is certified per the provisions of 14.5.2 or 14.5.3.2. Once the student-athlete has been certified, he or she will remain eligible for the remainder of the season under this provision even if he or she falls below the minimum required grade-point average at a later time during the academic year."
- Source: All nine members of the Big Sky Conference, all 11 members of the Big Ten Conference and all 11 members of the Southeastern Conference.
- Effective Date: August 1, 1992; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1992.
- Rationale: The current NCAA satisfactory-progress rule, with a quantitative requirement of an average of 12 credits per term for either the student-athlete's cumulative record at the certifying institution or for the previous academic year, does not contain a qualitative-progress requirement. This proposal would ensure that while a student-athlete is earning credit hours toward a specified degree, at most institutions, the individual is in a qualitative position to earn a degree.

1992 Convention Proceedings

Action: Moot due to the adoption of No. 21, Part B.

NO. 24 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

- Intent: To increase from 24 to 27 the minimum number of academic credits a student-athlete must earn each year after the first academic year in residence for purposes of fulfilling satisfactoryprogress requirements, to amend the "midterm" certification option after the freshman year to require a student-athlete to earn at least 14 hours per term or 27 semester or 40 quarter hours during the institution's preceding two semesters or three quarters, and to establish a prorated satisfactory-progress waiver for institutions that require fewer than 120 semester or 180 quarter hours for graduation.
- Bylaws: Amend 14.5.2, page 137, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.5.2 Eligibility for Competition. Eligibility for competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in any sport at the certifying institution shall be determined by the student-athlete's academic record in existence at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year, based upon:

- "(a) Satisfactory completion prior to each fall term of a the following cumulative total of academic semester or quarter hours equivalent to an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, of academic credit:
 - "(1) 24 semester or 36 quarter hours by the beginning of the second academic year;
 - "(2) 51 semester or 76 quarter hours by the beginning of the third academic year;
 - "(3) 78 semester or 116 quarter hours by the beginning of the fourth academic year, or
 - "(4) 105 semester or 156 quarter hours by the beginning of the fifth academic year; or
- "(b) For students who have spent two or more academic years in residence, Ssatisfactory completion of 24 27 semester or 36 40 quarter hours of academic credit since the beginning of the previous fall term."

[Remainder of 14.5.2 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.3, page 138, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

- "14.5.3 Regulations for Administration of Satisfactory Progress [14.5.3.1 unchanged.]
 - "14.5.3.2 Certification at Beginning of Fall Term. A studentathlete's eligibility under either satisfactory-progress option (per 14.5.2) shall be determined on the basis of the student's

	 A-27
oistative Proposals	

academic record in existence at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year. If the student-athlete is ineligible under the provisions of the satisfactory-progress legislation at the beginning of the fall term, eligibility may be reinstated at the beginning of any other regular term of that academic year, based upon:

- "(a) Satisfactory completion of a cumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit that is equivalent to an average of at least 12 semester, or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years during the first academic year and 14 semester or quarter hours during each previous academic term during the second and subsequent academic years in which the student athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms. On
- "(b) For student-athletes who have spent one academic year in residence, ssatisfactory completion of 243 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit since the beginning of the certifying institution's preceding regular two semesters or three quarters, or
- "(c) For student-athletes who have spent more than one academic year in residence, satisfactory completion of 27 semester or 40 quarter hours of academic credit since the beginning of the certifying institution's preceding regular two semesters or three quarters."
- C. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.5, page 140, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.5.5 Waivers of Satisfactory-Progress Rule. The Academic Requirements Committee shall establish appropriate criteria for, waivers of this legislation. Such waivers shall be administered by the conference members of the Association or, in the case of an independent institution, by the Eligibility Committee. Waivers of the satisfactory-progress rule may be granted under any of the following conditions:

[14.5.5-(a) and (b) unchanged.]

"(c) Nonstandard Hours for Graduation — An institution that requires fewer than 120 semester or 180 quarter hours for a baccalaureate degree may replace the requirements specified in 14.5.2 and 14.5.3.2 with a prorated requirement that shall not be less than 12 semester or quarter hours of academic credit per semester or quarter."

Source: Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; University of Washington, and Washington State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992; for those student-athletes first en-

Stering Divisions I and II member institutions subsequent to the

Rationale: The current satisfactory-progress rule requires a student-athlete to complete successfully 24 semester or 36 quarter hours per academic year. Passage of the proposed legislation would increase the number of hours required to maintain satisfactory progress and move student-athletes closer to graduation by the end of their athletics eligibility. The proposal increases satisfactory-progress requirements after the freshman year, thus acknowledging the difficult transition that often occurs during the freshman year.

Action: Defeated in Division I (148-175, two abstentions), roll-call vote. Not moved in Division II.

NO. 25 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS — REMEDIAL, TUTORIAL OR NONCREDIT COURSES

Intent: To eliminate the use of remedial, tutorial or noncredit cours-

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.3.6, pages 138-139, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]
"14.5.3.6 Remedial, Tutorial or Noncredit Courses. Remedial, tutorial or noncredit courses may **not** be used by the student to satisfy the minimum academic progress requirements only if they meet all of the following conditions:

- "(a) The courses must be considered by the institution to be prerequisites for specific courses acceptable for any degree program;
- "(b) The courses must be given the same weight as others in the institution in determining the student's status for full-time enrollment;
- "(c) Noncredit courses may not exceed the maximum institutional limit for such courses in any baccalaureate degree program (or the student's specific baccalaureate degree program once a program has been designated), and
- "(d) For those students first enrolled in the certifying institution beginning with the 1986-87 academic year, the credit in such courses shall not exceed 12 semester or 18 quarter hours, and the courses must be taken during the student's first academic year of collegiate enrollment."

Source: All eight members of the Colonial Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993; for those student-athletes who initially enroll at the certifying institution during the 1992-93 academic year.

Rationale: As a means of strengthening academic standards and increasing progress toward a degree, remedial, tutorial or noncredit courses, which usually will not count toward graduation, should likewise not be considered in maintaining satisfactory progress. The use of remedial courses in meeting satisfactory progress predates most legislation adopted in recent years to strengthen academic requirements and runs counter to most of these initiatives. The recent liberalization of summer financial

	٨	2
eoislative Proposals	 W .	4

aid legislation now allows for a student-athlete to receive aid for two summers and two semesters in order to achieve the first year certification of 24 semester hours. The student-athlete who truly is prepared for college work should not need to rely on non-countable credit to meet this standard.

Action: Motion in Division I to refer to the Academic Requirements
Committee was approved (274-50), roll-call vote. Not moved in Division II.

NO. 25-1 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS — REMEDIAL, TUTORIAL OR NONCREDIT COURSES

Intent: To delay the effective date of Proposal No. 25 until August 1995.

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]
"Effective Date: August 1, 1993 August 1, 1995; for those students athletes who initially enroll at the certifying institution during the 1992-93 1994-95 academic year."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Moot due to referral of No. 25. Originally adopted by Division I (299-29), roll-call vote. Not moved in Division II.

NO. 26 TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY — NONQUALIFIER

Intent: To require two-year college transfer students who were partial qualifiers or nonqualifiers to fulfill an academic year of residence before being eligible to compete upon transfer to a Division I institution and to specify that the current two-year college transfer rule will continue to govern such students' eligibility for practice and institutional financial aid.

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.4.1.2, page 143, as follows: [Division I only, roll call]

"14.6.4.1.2 Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier. The student who was not a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) is not eligible for competition during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution. Such a student is eligible for institutional financial aid. and practice and competition the first academic year in residence only if the student has graduated from the two-year college, has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution and has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least three semesters or four quarters (excluding summer terms). In addition, such a student who first enrolled as a regular student in a two-year institution after August 1, 1988, must have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (see 14.6 4.4.3.2)."

[Remainder of 14.6.4.1.2 unchanged.]

 members of the Big Ten Conference and all 11 members of the Southeastern Conference.

Effective Date. August 1, 1992; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The academic performance and graduation rates of twoyear college transfers, particularly for transfers who are not full qualifiers upon graduation from high school, are areas of increasing concern. Requiring a two-year college transfer who was not a full qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) to fulfill a year of residence will provide an easier academic transition to the four-year institution and allow the individual to demonstrate satisfactory progress at the certifying institution.

Action: Defeated in Division I (98-225, three abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 27 RESOLUTION: ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, at the 1991 NCAA Convention, the NCAA membership adopted Proposal No 58, which directed the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee to review the research data and to recommend legislation to strengthen the current NCAA requirements for both initial eligibility and continuing eligibility; and

"Whereas, at the 1991 Convention, certain delegates directly questioned the use and meaning of the word 'strengthen'; and

"Whereas, at the 1991 Convention, members of the Academic Requirements Committee and the NCAA Presidents Commission assured the NCAA membership that the use of the word 'strengthen' in Proposal No. 58 would not bind the Academic Requirements Committee to strengthen such requirements regardless of the research data, and assured the membership that the committee would be directed to recommend the 'appropriate' legislation; and

"Whereas, in the March 27, 1991, edition of The NCAA News, the Academic Requirements Committee expressed confusion and doubts as to the meaning of the word 'strengthen' as used in Proposal No. 58:

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA membership direct the Academic Requirements Committee to review the research data and to recommend legislation to lessen, leave in place or to strengthen the current NCAA requirements for both initial eligibility and continuing eligibility; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the committee reevaluate the research and present its recommendations for review by the Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council, and that the Commission and/or the Council submit appropriate legislation concerning academic requirements for consideration at the 1993 Convention, and that each amendment offered at future Conventions as a result of the committee's recommendations based on the NCAA Academic Performance Study be presented to the delegates of the Convention with research data that supports the amendment or the amendment must be withdrawn."

egislative Proposals	 A-	31
egislative Proposals	 A-	3

Source: All 10 members of the Big East Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order in Divisions I and II. NO. 28 COACHES' ATHLETICALLY RELATED INCOME

Intent: To specify that coaches in Divisions I and II must receive prior annual written approval from the institution's chief execu,; tive officer (1) for all athletically related income and benefits from sources outside the institution; (2) to use, directly or by ımplication, the institution's name or logo in the endorsement of

commercial products or services for personal gain, and (3) to accommercial cept outside compensation or gratuities from athletics shoe, ap parel or equipment manufacturers in exchange for the use of such merchandise during practice or competition.

A. Bylaws: Amend 11.2.2, page 50, as follows: [Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call] "11.2.2 Report of Athletically Related Income. Contractual agree." ments, including letters of appointment, between a full-time or part-time coach and an institution shall include the stipulation that the coach is required to report annually (in writing or orally) receive annually prior written approval from the chief executive officer for all athletically related income and benefits from sources outside the institution through the athletics director to the institution tion's chief executive officer. Sources of such income shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- "(a) Income from annuities;
- "(b) Sports camps;
- "(c) Housing benefits (including preferential housing arrange ments);
- "(d) Country club memberships;
- "(e) Complimentary ticket sales;
- "(f) Television and radio programs, and
- "(g) Endorsement or consultation contracts with athletics shoe, is apparel or equipment manufacturers."
- B. Bylaws: Amend 11.3.2, page 51, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call] "11.3.2 INCOME IN ADDITION TO INSTITUTIONAL SALARY: "11.3.2 Bona Fide Outside Employment. A staff member may earn, income in addition to the institutional salary by performing services for outside groups, provided the compensation is for additional work actually performed and at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locality for services of like character; further, such outside work must be in conformity with institutional policy and with the approval of the institution. In Divisions I and II, athletically related income requires the prior written approval of the institution's chief executive officer.

[11.3.2.2 through 11.3.2.4 unchanged.]

"11.3.2.5 Endorsement of Commercial Products. Athletics department staff members shall not use, directly or by implication, the institution's name or logo in the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain without prior written approval from the institution's chief executive officer in Divisions I and II and without prior approval from the institution in Division III.

[11.3.2.6 unchanged.]

"11.3.2.7 Compensation in Exchange for Use of Merchandise. Staff members of a member institution's athletics department shall not accept, prior to receiving approval (in writing in Divisions I and II) from the institution's chief executive officer, compensation or gratuities (excluding institutionally administered funds) from an athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturer in exchange for the use of such merchandise during practice or competition by the institution's student-athletes."

[Remainder of 11.3.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal is consistent with the Commission's ultimate goal of establishing full control and accountability for all athletically related income received by a coach in order to assure that the requirements of Bylaw 11.3.1, which state that the institution (as opposed to any outside source) shall remain in control of determining who is to be its employee and the amount of salary the employee is to receive within the restrictions specified by NCAA legislation, are satisfied. Such control would be established through requiring that all athletically related compensation from any source, including that which might now be paid directly to the coach, receive the prior written approval of the Division I or Division II member institution's chief executive officer. The Commission's objective is to eliminate any possible conflicts of interest that may exist under current NCAA legislation concerning athletically related income.

Action: Part A was adopted by Division I (296-23, three abstentions) and Division II (146-43, one abstention), roll-call votes. Part B was adopted by all divisions (299-19, four abstentions, Division I; 152-33, Division II; 222-12, one abstention, Division III), rollcall votes.

NO. 29 ANNUAL COACHES CERTIFICATION -DIVISION II

Intent: To establish a coaches certification program in Division II similar to the certification program established in Division I.

Bylaws: Amend 11.5, pages 56-57, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call] "11.5 CERTIFICATION TO RECRUIT OFF CAMPUS

A-33 Legislative Proposals __

"11.5.1 Divisions I and II Regulations. The provisions of this section apply to all Division I and Division II sports.

"11.5.1.1 Annual Certification Requirement. Only those coaches who have been certified may contact or evaluate any prospective student-athletes off campus. Certification must occur on an annual basis.

"11.5.1.1.1 Certification Administration. Such certification procedures shall be established by the NCAA national office in a standardized format and administered for its member institutions by the member conferences of the Association or, in the case of an independent institution, by the NCAA national office or the conference office that administers the National Letter of Intent for that institution. Such certification procedures shall include a requirement that the coaches shall have taken a standardized national test covering NCAA recruiting legislation.

"11.5.1.1.2 NCAA Approval. Each member conference shall report annually to the NCAA, on a form approved by the Council, the procedures it utilizes to certify coaches to recruit off campus."

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Rationale: It is important for each member institution to assure that recruiting rules and regulations are being understood and followed by its coaches and institutional staff members who are permitted to recruit off campus. Often, an institution will hire a coach or staff member who has little or no college coaching experience and whose knowledge of NCAA recruiting rules is lacking. A certification program would assure each Division II member institution that its recruiters have a sufficient understanding of NCAA recruiting rules before they are permitted to recruit off campus while encouraging a uniform application of these rules.

Action: Adopted by Division II (142-55), roll-call vote.

NO. 30 SUMMER FINANCIAL AID — INCOMING STUDENT-ATHLETES

Intent: To permit member institutions to provide summer financial aid to incoming student-athletes from athletically related sources, provided the student-athletes qualify for such financial aid on the same basis as other students generally.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.7.1.2, page 165, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"15.2.7.1.2 Summer Financial Aid — Incoming Student-Athletes.

The following conditions apply to the awarding of financial aid to a student-athlete to attend an institution in the summer prior

-34 ________ 1992 Convention Proceedings

to the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment:

[15.2.7.1.2-(a) through 15.2.7.1.2-(c) unchanged.]

- "(d) In Divisions I and II, 7the awarding institution certifies in writing that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability the student-athlete qualifies to receive such aid on the same basis as other students generally. The written certification shall be on file in the office of the director of athletics and shall be signed by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid. The source of any funds used directly to support a student-athlete's attendance in summer school may be athletically related, and
- "(e) In Division III, 7the awarding institution certifies in writing that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability. The written certification shall be on file in the office of the director of athletics and shall be signed by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid."

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The intent of Bylaw 15.2.7.1 2 (1990 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 32) was to provide greater opportunity for incoming student-athletes (prior to initial collegiate enrollment) to receive financial aid to attend an institution's summer term. That being the case, it should be permissible to utilize athletically related funds to support directly the attendance of these student-athletes in summer school, provided the student-athletes qualify for the financial aid on the same basis as other students in general attending summer school.

Action: Defeated by Division I (140-175, eight abstentions) and Division II (59-135, two abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 31 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Intent: In sports other than cross country, football, and indoor and outdoor track and field, to reduce the playing and practice season from 21 to 18 weeks; to establish specified starting dates for practice and competition, and to establish one traditional season in the sports of cross country and indoor and outdoor track and field, respectively, in which all practice and competition must occur. [Note: This proposal is presented in a nontraditional format. A chart summarizing the proposal is contained in Appendix C.]

A.	Bylaws: Amend 171, pages 209-320, for each sport (other
	than cross country, football, indoor and outdoor track and field
	by amending the respective section entitled "Length of Playing
	Season," as follows:

[Division	Ш	only,	roll	call
-----------	---	-------	------	------

gislative Proposals	Α-	3.
3.0.0		

- "17.___.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) shall be limited to the following:
- "(b) Division III A maximum of 21 18 weeks, except in the sports of cross country, football, indoor and outdoor track and field. In the sports of cross country, football and indoor and outdoor track and field, the playing season is confined to the time between the first permissible practice date and the end of the playing season."
- B. Bylaws: Amend 17._____.2, pages 209-320 for each sport (other than football) by amending the respective section entitled "Preseason Practice and First Contest Date or First Date of Competition," as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

- "17.___.2 Preseason Practice and First Contest or First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions or engage in its first contest or first date of competition with outside competition in each segment prior to the following dates.
- "17.___.2.1 Preseason Practice
- "(a) Fall Sports Other Than Football (cross country, field hockey, soccer, women's volleyball) In all fall sports other than football, the date that permits a maximum of 18 'practice opportunities' (see 17.02.13) prior to the first scheduled intercollegiate contest.
- "(b) Winter Sports (basketball, ice hockey, swimming, indoor track and field, wrestling).
 - "(1) Ice Hockey, Swimming and Wrestling 19 weeks prior to the first round of the NCAA Division III championship in that sport.
 - "(2) Basketball Off-court practice may not occur prior to 19 weeks before the date of the first round of the NCAA Division III Basketball Championship. On-court practice may not occur prior to November 1.
 - "(3) Indoor Track and Field November 1.
- "(c) Spring Sports (baseball, men's golf, lacrosse, softball, tennis, outdoor track and field):
 - "(1) Traditional Segment February 1.
 - "(2) Nontraditional Segment First day of classes, except that in outdoor track and field, a member institution shall not conduct a nontraditional and traditional segment."
- C. Bylaws: Amend 17._.2.2, pages 209-320, for each sport (other than football) by amending the respective section entitled "First Contest Date/First Date of Competition," as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

A-36 ________1992 Convention Proceedings

- "17.___.2.2 First Contest Date/First Date of Competition
- "(a) Fall Sports Other Than Football
 - "(1) Cross Country, Soccer, Women's Volleyball The date 10 weeks prior to the first round of the NCAA championship in that sport.
 - "(2) Field Hockey The date nine weeks prior to the first round of the NCAA championship in that sport.
 - "(3) Exhibition Scrimmage In cross country, soccer, women's volleyball and field hockey, a member institution may conduct one exhibition scrimmage during the permissible preseason practice period that counts in the institution's maximum number of contests in that sport.
- "(b) Winter Sports Other Than Basketball (ice hockey, swimming, indoor track and field, wrestling) — November 1. [Note: The first permissible contest date in the sport of basketball remains the Friday preceding Thanksgiving.]
- "(c) Spring Sports (baseball, men's golf, lacrosse, softball, tennis, outdoor track and field).
 - "(1) Traditional Segment February 1.
 - "(2) Nontraditional Segment First day of classes.
 - [Note: In outdoor track and field, a member institution shall conduct only a traditional segment, which may include time off during the segment.]"
- D. Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, pages 209-320, for each sport by amending the respective section entitled "End of Regular Playing Season." as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

- "17.___.3 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition by the following dates:
- "(b) Division III Fall Sports
 - "(1) Traditional Segment The last regular season contest (which shall be conducted not later than the NCAA championship in that sport) or postseason competition when selected for that competition.
 - "(2) Nontraditional Segment The last date of exams for the regular academic year at the institution.
- "(c) Division III Winter Sports The last regular season contest (which shall be conducted not later than the NCAA championship in that sport) or postseason competition when selected for that competition.
- "(d) Division III Spring Sports The last regular season contest (which shall be conducted not later than the

1 3 . 2 . 2	
gislative Proposals	A-37
EMMINIC I TODOSHIN	 M + 7 /

NCAA championship in that sport) or postseason; competition when selected for that competition."

E. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.6, page 204, by adding new 17.1.6.2 renumbering subsequent paragraphs as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.1.6.2 Nontraditional Segment. In sports in which a non-traditional segment is permissible, countable athletically related activities shall be limited to four days per week."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: This proposal is supported by the Division III Steering Committee and takes into account the feedback the steering committee received from the Division III membership regarding playing and practice seasons, both at the 1991 Convention and through correspondence received since that time. Further, the decrease in the length of the Division III playing season to 18 weeks is consistent with the Division III goal of maintaining a proper balance between athletics and academics. The legislation also will minimize class time missed due to competition and provide greater opportunity for the student-athlete to integrate into the mainstream of the general student body. The establishment of uniform dates for starting and concluding the playing season results is a cost savings and will further enhance the principle of competitive equity.

Action: Defeated by Division III (36-216, three abstentions) roll-call vote, as amended by No. 31-2.

NO. 31-1 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Intent: To establish September 1 or the first day of classes as the first permissible day for preseason practice or competition during the nontraditional segment for spring sports.

A. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 31-B, 17.__.2.1, as follows:
[Division III only, roll call]

"17.__.2.1 Preseason Practice

[17. .2.1-(a) and 17.__.2.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Spring Sports (baseball, men's golf, lacrosse, softball, tennis, outdoor track and field):

[17.__.2.1-(c)-(1) unchanged.]

"(2) Nontraditional Segment — September 1 or the Ffirst day of classes, whichever date occurs first, except that in outdoor track and field, a member institution shall not conduct a nontraditional and traditional segment."

B. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 31-C, 17._.2.2, as follows: [Division III only, roll call]

._____1992 Convention Proceedings

"17.__.2.2 First Contest Date/First Date of Competition

[17.__.2.2-(a) and 17.__.2.2-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Spring Sports (baseball, men's golf, lacrosse, softball, tennis, outdoor track and field):

[17,__,2.2-(c)-(1) unchanged.]

"(2) Nontraditional Segment — September 1 or the Ffirst day of classes, whichever date occurs first.

[Note: In outdoor track and field, a member institution shall conduct only a traditional segment, which may include time off during the segment.]"

Source: Brandeis University, Elmira College, Hartwick College, State University College at New Paltz, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, University of Rochester, Skidmore College and Utica College.

Rationale: This proposal will provide all schools with the same starting date.

*Action: Defeated by Division III (89-161, three abstentions) roll-call vote.

NO. 31-2 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Intent: To permit the sport of swimming to begin preseason practice sessions 20 weeks prior to the first round of the NCAA championship in that sport.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 31-B, 17.__.2.1, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.__.2.1 Preseason Practice

[17.__.2.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Winter Sports (basketball, ice hockey, swimming, indoor track and field, wrestling):

"(1) Swimming—20 weeks prior to the first round of the NCAA Division III championship in that sport.

"(2) Ice hockey, Swimming and Wrestling—19 weeks prior to the first round of the NCAA Division III championship in that sport."

[17.__.2.1-(b)-(2) and 17.2.1-(b)-(3), renumbered as 17.__.2.1-(b)-(3) and 17.__.2.1-(b)-(4), and 17._..2.1-(c), unchanged.

Source. NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Action: Adopted by Division III (201-37, 17 abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 32 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Intent: To decrease the length of the Division III playing and practice season by eliminating split segments (nontraditional/traditional) in sports other than tennis and men's golf; to specify

l porer	lative Proposal	le le	A-30

starting dates for practice and competition for each sport conducted traditionally during the fall, winter and spring seasons, and to reduce the number of contests for those sports that previously had additional contests during a nontraditional segment (i.e., baseball, softball, women's volleyball, soccer). [Note: This proposal is presented in a nontraditional format. A chart summarizing the proposal is contained in Appendix D of the Official Notice.]

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, pages 209-320, by amending the respective section entitled "Length of Playing Season," for the sports of tennis and men's golf, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

- "17.___.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) in the sports of tennis and men's golf shall be limited to the following:
- "(b) Division III A maximum of 21 18 weeks."
- B. Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, pages 209-320, for each sport by amending the respective section entitled "Preseason Practice and First Contest Date or First Date of Competition," as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

- "17.___.2 Preseason Practice and First Contest or First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions or engage in its first contest or first date of competition with outside competition in each segment prior to the following dates:
 - "17.___.2.1 Preseason Practice
 - "(a) Fall Sports (cross country, field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball). In fall sports other than football, the date that permits a maximum of 16 practice opportunities (see 17.02.13) prior to the first scheduled intercollegiate contest;
 - "(b) Winter Sports (basketball, ice hockey, swimming and diving, indoor track and field and wrestling)

 November 1:
 - "(c) Spring Sports Other Than Tennis and Men's Golf (baseball, lacrosse, softball, and outdoor track and field) February I. and
 - "(d) Tennis and Men's Golf If the traditional segment is conducted during the fall, practice may begin not earlier than the date that permits 16 practice opportunities (see 17.02.13) prior to the first intercollegiate contest and practice during the spring may begin not earlier than March I. If the traditional segment is conducted during the spring, practice may begin not earlier than February 1, and practice during the fall may

begin not earlier than the first day of classes.

- "17. .2.2 First Contest/Date of Competition
- "(a) Fall Sports (cross country, field hockey, football, soccer and women's volleyball) — The first Friday following Labor Day;
- "(b) Winter Sports Other Than Basketball (ice hockey, swimming and diving, indoor track and field and wrestling) — November 1;
- "(c) Spring Sports Other Than Tennis and Men's Golf (baseball, lacrosse, softball and outdoor track and field) — February 1, and
- "(d) Tennis and Men's Golf If the traditional segment is conducted during the fall, competition may begin not earlier than the first Friday following Labor Day and competition during the spring may begin not earlier than March 1. If the traditional segment is conducted during the spring, competition may begin not earlier than February 1 and competition during the fall may begin not earlier than the first day of classes."
- C. Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, pages 209-320, for each sport by amending the respective section entitled "End of Regular Playing Season," as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

- "17.___.3 A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (meets and practice meets) by the following dates:
 - "17.__.3.1 Division III The conclusion of the NCAA championship in that sport. In men's golf and tennis, any segment conducted during the fall must conclude not later than November 1."
- D. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5, 17.14.4, 17.15.4 and 17.19.6, pages 217-307, in the sports of basketball, soccer, softball and women's volleyball, by amending the respective section entitled "Number of Contests/Dates of Competition," as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

- "17.____.4.1 A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition during the institution's playing season to the following number of contests/dates of competition (games or scrimmages), except for those contests/dates of competition excluded under 17.___.4.2:
- "Baseball 45 (with not more than 36 during the traditional segment).
- "Softball -45 (with not more than 36 during the traditional segment).
- "Soccer 20 contests during the traditional segment and five dates of competition during the nontraditional segment.
- "Women's Volleyball 22 during the traditional segment and five during the nontraditional segment."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).	
Lagislatura Proposals	Δ

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: While the Division III Steering Committee supports the adoption of Proposal No. 31, this proposal fulfills the required ments of 1991 Convention Proposal No. 117, which was a resolution requiring the steering committee to sponsor legislation to decrease the length of the Division III playing season and to eliminate split seasons (in sports other than men's golf and tential). According to the sponsors of 1991 Convention Proposal No. 117, elimination of split seasons minimizes missed class time due to competition and provides greater opportunity for the student-athlete to pursue other educational interests during the off season. The establishment of uniform dates for starting and concluding the playing season will result in a cost savings and will further enhance the principle of competitive equity.

Action: Defeated by Division III (41-211, one abstention), roll-call, vote.

NO. 32-1 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Intent: To revise the starting dates for practice and competition in the sports of tennis and men's golf when the traditional playing segment is conducted during the fall.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 32-B, 17.__.2.1 and 17.__.2.2, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.__.2.1 Preseason Practice

[17._.2.1-(a) through 17._.2.1-(c) unchanged.]

- "(d) Tennis and Men's Golf If the traditional segment is conducted during the fall, practice may begin not earlier than the date that permits 16 practice opportunities (see 17.02.13) prior to the first intercollegiate contest and practice during the spring may begin not earlier than March 1. If the traditional segment is conducted during the spring, practice may begin not earlier than February 1, and practice during the fall may begin not earlier than September 1 or the first day of classes, whichever occurs first.
- "17.__.2.2 First Contest/Date of Competition
- [17.__.2.2-(a) through 17.__.2.2-(c) unchanged.]
- "(d) Tennis and Men's Golf If the traditional segment is conducted during the fall, competition may begin not earlier than the first Fnday following Labor Day September 1 or the first day of classes, whichever occurs first, and competition during the spring may begin not earlier than March 1. If the traditional segment is conducted during the spring, competition may begin not earlier than February 1 and competition during the fall may begin not earlier than September 1 or the first day of classes, whichever occurs first."

 A State University College at New Paltz, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, University of Rochester, Skidmore College and Utica College.

Rationale: This amendment will provide all schools with the same starting date.

Action: Defeated by Division III (113-127, three abstentions), roll-

NO. 33 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

test date in all Division III sports except basketball, football and ice hockey; to limit countable athletically related activities during the nontraditional segment to four days per week, and to apply the regulations governing missed class time to both the traditional and nontraditional segments. [Note: Section A of this proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, pages 209-320, for each sport except basketball, football and ice hockey by amending the respective section entitled "First Contest Date/First Date of Competition," as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

- "17.__.2 First Contest Date/First Date of Competition
- "17.___.2.2.1 Traditional Segment
- "(b) Division III August 24 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first First Friday following Labor Day.
- "17.___.2.2.2 Nontraditional Segment
- "(b) Division III September 1 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first First Friday following Labor Day."
- B. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.6 by adding new 17.1.6.2, page 204, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.1.6.2 Nontraditional Segment. During the nontraditional segment, countable athletically related activities shall be limited to four days per week."

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.7.1, page 204, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.1.7.1 Missed Class Time for Practice Activities — Football and Basketball and Traditional Both Segments in All Other Sports Except Golf. In the sports of football and basketball and during the traditional and nontraditional segments in all other sports except golf, no class time shall be missed for practice activities except when a team is traveling to an away-from-home contest and the practice is in conjunction with the contest.

· / . · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	A-43
eoislativeProposals	 11 13

"17.1.7.1.1 Nontraditional-Segment Exception An institution that schedules 50 percent or more of its contests or dates of competition in the nontraditional segment may elect to utilize the regulations applicable to the traditional segment as set forth in 17.1.7.1."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The adoption of Proposal No. 39 at the 1991 Convention left several issues related to Division III playing and practice seasons unresolved. This proposal will address those issues by establishing a uniform starting date for competition (in sports other than basketball, football and ice hockey) and by placing additional limitations on countable athletically related activities and missed class time during the nontraditional segment. The proposal is consistent with the principles of 1991 Convention Proposal No. 39 and will reduce class time missed for competition and create more time for student-athletes to integrate with the student body. In addition, this proposal should result in a cost savings for Division III institutions.

Action: Part A was defeated by Division III (72-182, one abstention), roll-call vote, as amended by No. 33-1. Part B was defeated by Division III (106-150, five abstentions), roll-call vote. Part C was adopted by Division III (186-66, six abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 33-1 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Intent: To specify that the first contest date/date of competition during the nontraditional segment for each sport except basketball, football and ice hockey shall be September 1 or the first day of classes.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 33-A, 17.__.2.2.2, as follows:
[Division III only, roll call]

- "17. .2.2.2 Nontraditional Segment
- "(b) Division III First Fnday following Labor Day September 1 or the first day of classes, whichever date occurs first."
- Source: Brandeis University, Elmira College, Hartwick College, State University College at New Paltz, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, University of Rochester, Skidmore College and Utica College.

Rationale: This proposal will provide all schools with the same starting date.

Action: Approved by Division III (181-72, three abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 34 DIVISION I-AAA FOOTBALL

Intent: To establish a Division I-AAA football classification specifically by: (1) specifying that eligibility to be classified in Division

1992 Convention	Proceeding

I-AAA will be open to all NCAA member institutions that were classified as Division I member institutions as of September 1, 1991; (2) specifying that the Division I-AAA football classification will not affect NCAA Council, Executive Committee or Presidents Commission's representation; (3) stipulating that voting on Division I-AAA football issues will take place during the annual Division I-AAA business session; (4) specifying that Divisions I-A and I-AA will have rescission rights over I-AAA football legislation, but that Division I-AAA will not have rescission rights over Division I-A or I-AA football legislation: (5) stipulating that a Division I-AAA member institution may have a maximum of three full-time coaches and that initially there will be no limit on the number of undergraduate assistant or restrictedearnings coaches in Division I-AAA football; (6) specifying that a maximum of seven coaches may be designated to recruit off campus; (7) establishing financial-aid guidelines for Division I-AAA football participants that will be the same as the current Division III guidelines, except that nonathletics achievement awards will not be permitted; (8) specifying that there will be no spring football practice in Division I-AAA; (9) stipulating that practice dates and first contest dates will be the same as those specified for Division III; (10) establishing a maximum of 10 contests; (11) specifying that in order to meet the minimum sports-sponsorship requirements for Division I. Division I-AAA institutions must play 50 percent or more of their contests against Division I institutions, and (12) resolving that the Division I-AA Football Championship will not be reduced in size for five years as a result of the adoption of this legislation.

A. Bylaws: Amend 20.01.2, page 339, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call] "20.01.2 Division Membership. Each active member institution and member conference is designated as a member of Division I, II or III for certain legislative and competitive purposes. In the sport of football only, Division I is divided into Division I-A and, Division I-AA and Division I-AAA (also see 20.7.1.1). Multidivision classification is permitted under specified circumstances (see 20.4)."

- Bylaws: Amend 20.1.1.2, page 339, as follows:

 [Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]
 "20.1.1.2 Divisions I-A and, I-AA and I-AAA Football. In the sport of football, Division I shall be divided into Division I-A and, Division I-AA and Division I-AAA"
- C. Bylaws: Amend 20.4.1.1, page 345, as follows: [Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call] "20.4.1.1 Division I Member. A member of Division I may petition to be classified in football in Division I-Ao, Division I-AA or Division I-AAA. If the petition is granted, the institution shall be entitled to vote in that division on legislative issues di-

Legislative Proposals	A 15

rectly affecting football. [Note: Initial declarations for Division I AAA football will be due June 1, 1992.

"20.4.1.1.1 Division I-AAA Football Eligibility. To be ell igible to be classified in Division I-AAA football, an institution must have been classified as a voting mem ber of Division I on September 1, 1991."

D. Bylaws: Amend 20.7.2, page 348, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call] "20.7.2 Members of Division I-A and Division I-AA and Division .

I-AAA in Football. "20.7.2.1 Division I-A and Division I-AA and Division I-A AAA Voting Separately. Members of Division I-A and, Divi: sion I-AA and Division I-AAA shall vote separately in their respective subdivisions on legislative issues that per ma tain only to football.

[20.7.2.2 unchanged.]

"20.7.2.3 Division I-AAA Rescission. A football provision adopted by Division I-AAA may be rescinded by a two-thirds vote of the combined members of Divisions I-A, Division I-AA and Division I-AAA present and vot-

[20.7.2.3 and 20.7.2.4, renumbered as 20.7.2.4 and 20.7.2.5, unchanged.]

E. Bylaws: Amend 20.9 by adding new 20.9.8, page 357, as follows: [Division I only, roll call]

"20.9.8 Division I-AAA Football Requirements. An institu-? tion classified in Division I-AAA shall meet the additional requirements listed below.

"20.9.8.1 Sports Sponsorship. The institution shall? sponsor in Division I a minimum of:

- "(a) Six varsity intercollegiate sports (football may be used if it meets the scheduling requirement set forth in 20.9.8.2) based on the minimum require. ments of 20.9.3 and 20.9.3.3 and involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females [Note: Seven varsity intercollegiate sports will be required, effective September 1, 1994.], and
- "(b) Six varsity intercollegiate sports based on the minimum requirements of 20.9.3 and 20.9.3.3 and involving all-female teams, subject to the waiver provision in 20.9.3.1. [Note: Seven varsity intercollegiate sports will be required, effective September 1, 1994.1

"20.9.8.2 Football-Scheduling Requirement. The institution shall schedule and play 50 percent or more of its football games against members of Division I in order for the sport to count toward the Division I

sports-sponsorship requirement.

"20.9.8.2.1 Contractual Waiver. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant a waiver of the provisions of 20.9.8.2 in cases of reclassification of an opponent when there is an enforceable game contract, executed in writing, or in the case of similar contractual problems.

"20.9.8.2.2 Geographical Waiver. An institution may appeal to the Council for a waiver of the scheduling requirements of 20.9.8.2 on the basis of geographical difficulty in achieving the minimum scheduling requirements. The Council may grant such waivers by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting.

"20.9.8.2.3 Canceled Games. A canceled game shall not be counted toward meeting the Division I. AAA scheduling criterion unless the Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, approves a waiver of the criterion in a situation in which:

- "(a) The member institution can document that it had scheduled (for that academic year) the appropriate minimum percentage of contests with members of Division I under enforceable game contracts executed in writing;
- "(b) An opponent canceled a game that it had contracted to play that academic year, and
- "(c) Despite a good-faith effort, the institution was unable to rearrange its schedule to play the appropriate percentage of contests with members of Divisions I-A, I-AA and I-AAA."

Constitution: Amend 4.1.1.1, pages 17-19, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"4.1.1.1 Division I Representatives. The 22 Division I representatives shall include at least four individuals from each of the Division I representation regions (as set forth in 4.7.2.1) and also shall include:

[4.1.1 1-(a) through 4.1.1.1-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Four representatives of Division I members that do not sponsor football in Divisions I-A or Division I-AA, and" [Remainder of 4.1.1.1 unchanged.]

Constitution: Amend 4.2.1.1, page 20, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"4.2.1.1 Other Members. The division vice-presidents shall be members, and nine other members shall be elected. Among those nine members:

	A-47
egislative Proposals	

"(a) Seven shall represent Division I members, including at least two women and including four members representing Division I-A, two members representing Division I-AA and one member representing Division I members that do not spon, sor football in Divisions I-A or I-AA;"

[Remainder of 4.2.1.1 unchanged.]

H. Constitution: Amend 4.5.1.1, page 23, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"4.5.1 1 Division I Representatives. The 22 Division I representatives shall include at least four from each of the four Division I representation regions (as set forth in 4.7.2.1) and also shall include:

[4.5.1.1-(a) through 4.5.1.1-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Four representatives of Division I members that do not sponsor football in Divisions I-A or I-AA, and

"(e) Remaining representatives selected at large, including one from Division I-AA and one from Division I-AA and one from Division I members that do not sponsor football in Divisions I-AA or I-AA."

I. Constitution: Amend 5.1.4.3.5, page 30, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"5.1.4.3.5 Football Classification, Voting. A member institution shall be entitled to vote on legislative issues pertaining only to football in the division in which it is classified in that sport.

[5.1.4.3.5.1 unchanged.]

"5.1.4.3.5.2 Divisions I-A, and I-AA and I-AAA Football. Members of Divisions I-A and I-AA and I-AAA shall vote separately in their respective subdivisions on legislative issues that pertain only to that sport."

[Remainder of 5.1.4.3.5 unchanged.]

J. Constitution: Amend 5.3.11.1 by adding new 5.3.11.1.3, page 37, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"5.3.11.1.3 Football Legislation — Division I-AAA. A federated provision pertaining only to football that is adopted by Division I-AAA in accordance with 5.1.4.3.5.2 may be rescinded by a two-thirds vote of the delegates of Divisions I-A, I-AA and I-AAA present and voting together. This rescission provision may be applied in the separate legislative session of Division I or in the joint session of all three divisions, but not in both."

K. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1, page 127, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.1 Eligibility for Financial Aid, Practice and Competition. A

student-athlete who enrolls in a Division I or Division II institution as an entering freshman with no previous full-time college attendance shall meet the following academic requirements, and any applicable institutional and conference regulations, to be considered a qualifier and thus be eligible for financial aid, practice and competition during the first academic year in residence. A Division I-AAA football student-athlete entering a Division I institution prior to August 1, 1993, shall not be subject to this legislation."

[Remainder of 14.3.1 unchanged.]

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.2, pages 129-134, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.2 Eligibility for Financial Aid, Practice and Competition — Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifiers

"14.3.2.1 Partial Qualifier

"14.3.2.1.1 Division I. An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who enrolls in a Division I institution and who is a partial qualifier (as defined in 14.02.9.2) may receive institutional financial aid (see 15.02.3.1 and 15.5.1.2.2) that is not from an athletics source and is based on financial need only, consistent with institutional and conference regulations, but may not practice or compete during the first academic year in residence. However, such a student who was not recruited (per 13.02.9.1) shall not be eligible for regularseason competition and practice but shall be eligible for nonathletics institutional financial aid, provided there is on file in the office of the athletics director certification by the faculty athletics representative, the admissions officer and the chair of the financial aid committee that admission and financial aid were granted without regard to athletics ability. A Division I-AAA football student-athlete entering a Division I institution prior to August 1, 1993, shall not be subject to this legislation.

[14.3.2.1.2 unchanged.]

"14.3.2.2 Nonqualifier

"14.3.2.2.1 Division I. An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who was recruited (per 13.02.9.1) and is not a qualifier (as defined in 14.02.9.1) at the time of enrollment in a Division I institution shall not be eligible for regular-season competition, practice or institutional financial aid during the first academic year in residence. However, such a student who was not recruited (per 13.02.9.1) shall not be eligible for regular-season competition and practice but shall be eligible for nonathletics institutional financial aid, provided there is on file in the office of the athletics director certification by the faculty athletics representa-

tive, the admissions officer and the chair of the finanticial aid committee that admission and financial aid were granted without regard to athletics ability. A Division I-AAA football student-athlete entering a Division I institution prior to August 1, 1993, shall not be subject to this legislation."

[Remainder of 14.3.2 unchanged.]

M. Bylaws: Amend 11.7 by adding new 11.7.4, page 63, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.7.4 Football — Division I-AAA. During the time period from January 1, 1993, through July 31, 1993, a maximum of seven Division I-AAA football coaches may contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus at any one time."

N. Bylaws: Amend 11.7 by adding new 11.7.4, pages 61-65, renumbering subsequent sections as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.7.4 Football — Division I-AAA

"11.7.4.1 Number Limits by Category:

"Head coach
"Full-time assistant coaches

"Undergraduate assistant coaches "Restricted-earnings coaches No Limit

"11.7.4.2 Exceptions. No individual other than coaches designated to fill the coaching categories set forth in 11.7.4.1 may participate in the coaching of the inter-

collegiate team of a member institution during any football game, practice or other organized activity, with the following excentions:

"11.7.4.2.1 Weight or Strength Coach. A weight (strength and conditioning) coach may conduct (flexibility, warm-up and physical conditioning activities prior to any game and prior to or during any practice or other organized activities without being included in the limitations on number of coaches.

"11.7.4.3 Contact and Evaluation of Prospective Student-Athletes Limited to Full-Time Coaches and a Maximum of Four Restricted-Earnings Coaches. Only those coaches who are counted by the institution within the numerical limitations on full-time head and assistant coaches and a maximum of four restricted-earnings coaches may contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus. The institution shall certify these seven individuals who fall within these number limitations and are thereby per-

mitted to contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus."

[11.7.4, renumbered as 11.7.5, unchanged.]

Bylaws: Amend 15.01 by adding new 15.01.11, page 158, as fol-

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.01.11 Division I-AAA Football Financial Aid. Studentathletes participating in Division I-AAA football shall be permitted to receive aid only on the basis of financial need (see 15.5.5.5). Division I-AAA football student-athletes entering a Division I institution prior to August 1, 1993, shall not be subject to this legislation."

P.* Bylaws: Amend 15.02.4, page 160, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.02.4 Full Grant-in-Aid

"15.02.4.1 All Divisions I and II Sports Other Than Division I-AAA Football. A full grant-in-aid is financial aid that consists of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books.

"15.02.4.2 Division III and Division I-AAA Football Participants. A full grant-in-aid is financial aid that consists of tuition and fees, room and board, required course-related books, transportation and other expenses incidental to attendance, provided the total value of all financial aid does not exceed the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution.

"15.02.4.2.1 Exception-Division I-AAA. Division I-AAA football student-athletes entering a Division I institution prior to August 1, 1993, shall be subject to the financial aid limitations in effect at the time of their initial enrollment."

Q. **Bylaws**: Amend 15.5.5 by adding new 15.5.5.5, page 176, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.5.5 Division I-AAA Football. The following limitations apply to Division I-AAA football student-athletes and the limitations specified in 15.5.5.1 through 15.5.5.4 shall not apply in that division. In addition, Division I-AAA football student-athletes entering a Division I institution prior to August 1, 1993, shall not be subject to the following legislation.

"15.5.5.5.1 Financial-Need Requirement. A Division I-AAA football institution shall not award financial aid to any football student-athlete except upon a showing of financial need by the recipient.

"15.5.5.2 Administration by Regular College Agency.

Á	50
А	N.

All forms of financial assistance for football studentathletes shall be handled through the regular college agency or committee that administers financial aid for all students.

"15.5.5.3. Written Offer of Aid. Financial assistance may be offered in writing only by the institution's director of financial aid or comparable campus official and not before the student-athlete has been admitted. "15.5.5.5.4 Report of Aid From Outside Sources. All financial assistance received by the football studentathlete from sources outside the institution shall bereported to the institution's director of financial aid. When outside aid is received after institutional financial aid has been offered to the student, the institution's director of financial aid shall be notified and an adjustment of the aid already offered shall take place in order that the total aid available from all sources does not exceed financial need.

"15.5.5.5.4.1 Off-Campus Employment Earnings. Off-campus employment income earned by the football student-athlete during the academic year is countable in assuring that the amount of aid received does not exceed the calculated amount of . the student-athlete's financial aid.

"15.5.5.5 Financial Aid Limit. A football student-athlete may not receive financial assistance based upon need in excess of the value of a full grant-in-aid (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board, required course-related books, transportation, and other expenses incidental to attendance), provided the total value of all financial aid does not exceed the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution.

"15.5.5.5.6 Aid Without Consideration of Need, Any assistance provided within the limit defined in 15.5.5.5.5 must be based on financial need, as determined by any need-analysis system that conforms to a uniform methodology approved by the U.S. Department of Education. However, loans and awards specified in the following subsections may be offered to football student-athletes without consideration of the recipient's needs.

"15.5.5.6.1 Loans. Legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to and administered on the same basis for all students.

"15.5.5.5.6.2 Academic Honor Awards. Academic honor awards that are part of the institution's normal arrangements for academic scholarships, awarded independently of athletics interests and

in amounts consistent with the pattern of all such awards made by the institution, may be offered

- "(a) A student who was in the upper 20 percent of the high-school graduating class or who earned a cumulative high-school grade-point average of at least 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) or who achieved a minimum ACT score of 25 or a minimum SAT score of 1.050.
- "(b) A student who does not qualify under (a) and who has completed at least one academic year in college and has earned a cumulative gradepoint average of 3.300 (on a 4.000 scale) for all academic work completed during the student's collegiate enrollment resulting in degree credits at the awarding institution.

"15.5.5.5.6.2.1 Additional Requirements. The following additional academic honor requirements shall be met:

- "(a) No quota of awards shall be designated for football student-athletes;
- "(b) Athletics participation shall not be required prior to or subsequent to college enrollment, and
- "(c) No athletics department staff member shall be involved in designating the recipients of such awards.

"15.5.5.6.3 Awards of Circumstance. Awards of circumstance may be given by the college or university, provided:

- "(a) These awards automatically are available to any and all members of the student body in general who meet certain publicized, objective qualifications and are awarded solely on bases having no relationship to athletics ability:
- "(b) The institution may establish no quota of such awards for football student-athletes:
- "(c) The awards shall be identified in the appropriate institutional publication listing financial aid awards available to all students, and each such award shall be reported to and specifically approved by the Council, and
- "(d) Such an award shall be provided automatically to any student who qualifies under the circumstances in question. The award to a student who qualifies under a particular set of circumstances would not qualify as an award

of circumstance if the selection of the student was at the institution's discretion.

"15.5.5.6.4 On-Campus Employment. On-campus employment offered by the awarding institution is permissible under the following conditions:

- "(a) Such employment is under the direction of the regular college agency or committee that administers such employment for all students, and
- "(b) The policies and practices in regard to such employment are identical for athletes and nonathletes.

"15.5.5.6.4.1 Aid From Outside Sources. Financial aid received through an established and continuing program that meets the provisions of 15.2.5.3 or 15.2.5.4 is permissible without consideration of the recipient's financial need.

"15.5.5.7 Leadership and Merit Awards — Need Consideration. An institution shall not provide leadership and merit awards to football student-athletes without consideration of the recipient's need, regardless of whether the awards are available automatically to members of the student body who meet certain publicized, objective, nonathletics criteria. However, an institution is permitted to provide football student-athletes with leadership and merit awards if such awards fall within the students' need limitations and athletics ability is not considered in the selection of the recipient. The composition of the financial aid package offered to a football student-athlete shall be consistent with the established policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students.

"15.5.5.8 Athletics Funds or Endowments. No part of an institution's financial aid budget shall be set aside for football student-athletes, nor may an institution establish athletically related quotas of financial aid recipients. However, income from endowment funds that were received by the institution prior to January 1, 1979, and specifically designated for student-athletes can be awarded to football student-athletes, provided the institution complies with the requirements set forth in 15.5.5.5.9.

"15.5.5.5.8.1 Athletics Need Fund. A Division I-AAA member may not establish an 'athletics need fund' for football student-athletes and advertise its availability to prospective football student-athletes who may qualify for need-based aid.

"15.5.5.9 Consistent Financial Aid Package. The

composition of the financial aid package offered to a football student-athlete shall be consistent with the established policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students and shall meet all of the following criteria:

- "(a) A member institution shall not consider athletics ability as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package;
- "(b) The financial aid procedures used for a football student-athlete are the same as the existing official financial aid policies of the institution;
- "(c) The financial aid package for a particular football student-athlete cannot be clearly distinguishable from the general pattern of all financial aid for all recipients at the institution, and
- "(d) The percentage of the total dollar value of institutionally administered grants awarded to football student-athletes shall be closely equivalent to the percentage of football student-athletes within the student body. A differential is defensible if it can be demonstrated that the average need of the football student-athletes at the institution is equivalently greater than the average need of other students.

"15.5.5.5.9.1 Consideration of Athletics in Packaging Formula. A financial aid package for a football student-athlete may be considered consistent with the established financial aid packaging policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students if it is equivalent to individual packages for other students with similar need characteristics, the package does not exceed the recipient's financial need and athletics ability is not considered in formulating the package.

"15.5.5.9.2 Specialized Interests in Activities as a Packaging Variable. A Division I-AAA member institution may offer a football student-athlete a financial aid package that takes into account variables in the packaging formula other than need (e.g., academic ability, minority status, specialized interests in activities other than athletics), provided th package does not exceed the recipient's financial need. A member institution shall not consider athletics ability as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package for a football student-athlete.

"15.5.5.5.9.3 Athletics Staff Involvement. Members of the athletics staff of a Division I-AAA member institution shall not be permitted to arrange or

gislative Proposals		A-55
Sistema		

modify the financial aid package (as assembled by the financial aid officer or financial aid committee) of a football student-athlete and are prohibited from being involved in any manner in the review of the institutional financial assistance to be awarded to a football student-athlete.

"15.5.5.5.9.4 Matrix-Rating System. In instances in which admissions officers use a matrix-rating system where, as part of the admissions process, factors other than academic ability are considered, once a decision is reached concerning admission, all consideration of athletics ability or participation shall be eliminated from any rating system before the football student-athlete's application is reviewed by the financial aid office.

"15.5.5.5.10 Faculty/Staff Benefits. Tuition remission, assistance or similar remuneration granted as a benefit of employment to a faculty or staff member shall not be calculated in the application of the Division I-AAA financial need criteria in the case of that faculty or staff member's children."

R. Bylaws: Amend 17.7, pages 238-242, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"17.7 FOOTBALL

[17.7.1 unchanged.]

"17.7.2 Preseason Practice

a member institution shall not commence official preseason football practice sessions, for the varsity, junior varsity of freshman team, prior to the date that will permit a maximum of 29 practice opportunities prior to its first scheduled intercollegiate game, except as provided for student-athletes who are first-time participants in Divisions I-A and I-AA (see 17.7.2.2). In Divisions I-AAA and III, a member institution shall not commence official preseason football practice sessions, for the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team, prior to the date that will permit a maximum of 27 practice opportunities prior to its first scheduled intercollegiate game (see 17.02.13).

[Remainder of 17.7.2 unchanged.]

"17.7.3 First Contest. In Divisions I-A, I-AA and II, a member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football prior to September 1 (or the preceding Saturday if September 1 falls on a Sunday or Monday) preceding Saturday if September 1 falls on a Sunday or Monday except when selected to participate in the National Football except when selected to participate in the National Football Coaches Refoundation benefit game or the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game, both sponsored by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics and played in the sociation of Collegiate Directors of Athletics and played in the second content of the se

week prior to the beginning of the regular playing season in football. In Divisions I-AAA and III, a member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football prior to the Friday or Saturday 11 weeks before the first round of the NCAA Division III Football Championship. [17.7.4 unchanged.]

"17.7.5 Number of Contests

"17.7.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total regular-season playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of football during the permissible football playing season in any one year to the following number of contests (games and scrimmages), except as provided for member institutions located in Alaska and Hawaii under 17.22.2, and except as provided for all members under 17.7.5.2;

"(a) Divisions I-A, I-AA and II - 11.

"(b) Division I-AAA — 10."

[17.7.5.1-(b), relettered as 17.7.5.1-(c), and remainder of 17.7 unchanged.]

5. Bylaws: Amend 17.7, pages 238-242, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"17.7 FOOTBALL

[17.7.1 through 17.7.3 unchanged.]

"17.7.4 End of Playing Season. A member institution's last contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football shall not be played outside the traditional segment (Division III) or after the second Saturday or Sunday in December (Divisions I and II), except for the following:

"(a) Spring Practice Scrimmage — Divisions I-A, I-AA and II. One scrimmage or contest at the conclusion of spring practice, provided the game is with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students or both, and

[Remainder of 17.7.5 unchanged.]

"17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football is prohibited, except for the following:

"(a) Spring Practice — Divisions I-A and I-AA. In Divisions I-A and I-AA, 15 postseason practice sessions are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 22 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar, with no practices permitted on Sunday. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 10 of the 15 sessions may involve contact. The amount of time that a student-athlete may be involved in such postseason practice activities shall be limited to a maximum of 20 hours per week;"

[Remainder of 17.7 unchanged.]

T. Resolution:

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, the NCAA Council directed a special Council subcommittee to develop legislation for sponsorship by the Council for the 1992 NCAA Convention that would establish a Division I-AAA football classification, and

"Whereas, the NCAA Council Subcommittee to Develop a Division I-AAA Football Classification is concerned that the Division I-AAA football classification could potentially cause Division I-AA football members to move to Division I-AAA in order to participate in a cost-containment football classification; and

"Whereas, such movement by Division I-AA members may jeopardize the existing Division I-AA championship format;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the existing Division I-AA Football Championship shall not be reduced in size from 1993 through 1997."

Source: NCAA Council (Subcommittee to Develop a Division I-AAA Football Classification) and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: Part T effective immediately. Parts A, B, C, D, F, G, H, I, J, M and S effective January 1, 1993. Parts E, K, L, N, O, P, Q and R effective August 1, 1993.

Rationale: This proposal provides an opportunity for more Division I institutions to participate in football. The Division I-AAA football classification will provide competitive opportunities for those Division I member institutions that can no longer play football at the Division II or III level as a result of the elimination of multidivision classification in football to continue their football programs. In addition, this proposal will ensure that institutions classified in Division II or III on September 1, 1991, will be unable to move their athletics programs to Division I for the purpose of participating in the sharing of Division I basketball funds while operating a low-cost football program. This legislation assures the protection of the present membership structure of Divisions II and III and at the same time does not deny Division II or III member institutions the opportunity to move their programs to Division I. Divisions II and III institutions will continue to have the option of playing Division I-A or I-AA football if those institutions opt to move their football programs to Division I.

Action: Parts A through D defeated, required approval by all three divisions (166-134, six abstentions, Division I; 68-107, 12 abstentions, Division II; 218-10, six abstentions, Division III), roll-call votes. Parts E through T moot due to defeat of Parts A through D. A motion to reconsider was defeated.

1992 Convention Proceedings

NO. 35 RESOLUTION: PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, for most of the past two decades, the NCAA has sought the most effective means of involving institutional chief executive officers at the policy-making level in intercollegiate athletics, and the NCAA Presidents Commission has attempted to enhance and define that involvement since its formation in 1984; and

"Whereas, the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics has stated its firm conviction that university presidents are the key to successful reform of intercollegiate athletics and must be in charge of the policies governing athletics at the institutional, conference and national levels; and

"Whereas, it is the belief of the Presidents Commission that the role of chief executive officers must be strengthened if these goals are to be realized and that the role of the Presidents Commission must be reexamined to assist toward that end; and

"Whereas, changes in the Association's legislative processes and enhancement of chief executive officers' relationships with other constituent groups in college athletics — both currently under study or development — are necessary if presidential authority is to be effectively realized; and

"Whereas, the concept of certification and possibly accreditation of athletics programs — also currently under study by the Association as a pilot project — is considered by many, including the Knight Commission, as a significant step toward enhanced institutional responsibility for intercollegiate athletics programs;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Presidents Commission, in consultation with the NCAA Council and other NCAA constituencies, be directed to conduct a study of all of these elements affecting presidential authority and institutional responsibility, and to submit appropriate legislation for action at the 1993 NCAA Convention."

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission (Subcommittee on Strategic Planning).

Action: Adopted (717-8, one abstention), roll-call vote.

NO. 36 RESOLUTION: FINANCIAL ISSUES

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, the NCAA Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council have addressed in the past two NCAA Conventions several means by which the costs of conducting athletics programs might be contained or reduced; and

"Whereas, the general financial condition of college athletics continues to be a matter of concern throughout the NCAA membership; and

"Whereas, the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics has identified financial integrity as one of the key elements

	·	۹-5
Legislative Proposals		

in the reform of intercollegiate athletics; and

"Whereas, such elements as the amount, source and basis of financial aid for student-athletes; the need to provide equitable athletics programs for men and women; the compensation of athletics personnel, and the influence of athletics foundations, booster organizations and media revenues all have a significant impact on both the financial condition and the financial integrity of college ath-

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Presidents Commisletics: sion, in consultation with the NCAA Council and other NCAA con- 43 stituencies, be directed to conduct a study of all of these elements affecting financial control and financial integrity of college athletics; and to conclude the study not later than June of 1993 in order that any appropriate legislation might be presented to the 1994 NCAA Convention."

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission (Subcommittee on Strategic Planning)

Action: Adopted (747-5, two abstentions), roll-call vote.

Academics

NO. 37 PRACTICE ELIGIBILITY

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete shall be enrolled as a degree-seeking student in order to be eligible for practice

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.1.5.1, pages 120-121, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.1.5.1 Requirement for Practice. To be eligible to participate - 2 in organized practice sessions, a student-athlete shall be enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies leading to abaccalaureate or equivalent degree as defined by the regulations of the certifying institution."

[Remainder of 14.1.5.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.1.7.1, page 122, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.1.7.1 Baccalaureate. To be eligible to represent an institution participate (i.e., practice or compete) in intercollegiate athletics competition, a student-athlete shall be enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program of studies leading to a baccalaureate or equivalent degree, as determined by the regulations of the institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Currently, a student-athlete is required to be enrolled in a program of studies leading to a baccalaureate or equivalent de-

. 1992 Convention Proceedings A-60

gree to be eligible for competition only. It is important that the requirements for practice and competition be consistent in regard to this issue. The Academic Requirements Committee believes that the current legislation permitting student-athletes to practice while not enrolled in a degree-seeking program of studies is a loophole that should be eliminated.

Action: Adopted.

FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT — FINAL NO. 38 SEMESTER/QUARTER

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete who competes while enrolled in less than a full-time program of studies during the final semester or quarter of a baccalaureate program while carrying for credit the courses necessary to complete degree requirements shall not forfeit further eligibility in all sports if the student completes all degree requirements during that semester or quarter and is eligible to receive the baccalaureate diploma on the institution's next degree-granting date.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.5.2.2.1, page 121, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"14.1.5.2.2.1 Exceptions. The following exceptions to the minimum 12-semester- or 12-quarter-hour enrollment are permitted:

"(a) Final Semester/Quarter. A student-athlete may compete while enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies, provided the student is enrolled in the final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate program and the institution certifies that the student is carrying (for credit) the courses necessary to complete degree requirements. The student granted eligibility under this provision shall be eligible for any NCAA championship that begins within 60 days following said semester or quarter, provided the student has not exhausted the five years or 10 semesters for completion of the individual's four seasons of eligibility (see 14.2). Thereafter, the student shall forfeit eligibility in all sports, unless the student completes all degree requirements during that semester or quarter and is eligible to receive the baccalaureate diploma on the institution's next degree-granting date."

[Remainder of 14.1.5.2.2.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will reward student-athletes who have shown the initiative and dedication to put themselves in a position to graduate and wish to further their academic and athletics interests during graduate school or by pursuing a second baccalaureate degree at the certifying institution. The proposal will serve to encourage the academic achievement of student-athletes and is consistent with the increased emphasis within the

	 A-61
gislative Proposals	

Association on the graduation of student-athletes.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 39 PARTIAL-QUALIFIER AND NONQUALIFIER ELIGIBILITY

Intent: To permit nonqualifiers and partial qualifiers in Division I to earn a fourth season of intercollegiate competition, provided they have completed 96 semester or 144 quarter units toward a specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution by the beginning of the fifth academic year following their initial full-time collegiate enrollment.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.3 by adding new 14.3.3.1, page 134, as follows: Division I only]

"14.3.3.1. Fourth Season of Competition — Division I. A fourth season of intercollegiate competition shall be granted to a nonqualifier or partial qualifier, provided that at the beginning of the fifth academic year following the student-athlete's initial full-time collegiate enrollment, the student-athlete has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 96 semester or 144 quarter units applicable toward a specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution. This provision shall be administered by the member conferences of the Association or, in the case of an independent institution, by the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee."

Source: All 10 members of the Big East Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1988.

Rationale: The purpose of this legislation simply is to restore a student-athlete's fourth season of eligibility after the student has proven his or her academic abilities by virtue of successfully completing 96 semester or 144 quarter units (80 percent of requirements) toward a specific baccalaureate degree. The membership of Division I has placed a firm and rigid initial-eligibility. requirement on student-athletes and has gone one step further # in disallowing athletics participation during the partial qualifier's and nonqualifier's first academic year. It seems unfair not to allow these students to regain a fourth season of competition by virtue of sound academic progress equal to that required of our other student-athletes. The studies on the academic performance of student-athletes, which place special emphasis on the effect of the Association's initial-eligibility legislation, should continue but in the meantime, this inequity should be dealt with; fairly.

Action: Defeated in Division I (153-167) as amended by Nos. 39-1, and 39-2.

A-62 _______1992 Convention Proceedings

NO. 39-1 PARTIAL-QUALIFIER AND NONQUALIFIER AID

Intent: To specify that a partial qualifier or nonqualifier in Division

I may earn a fourth season of competition if, at the beginning of
the fifth academic year, the student-athlete has completed satisfactorily the minimum number of semester or quarter units established pursuant to the Association's satisfactory-progress legislation.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 39, 14.3.3.1, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.3.3.1 Fourth Season of Competition — Division I. A fourth season of intercollegiate competition shall be granted to a non-qualifier or partial qualifier, provided that at the beginning of the fifth academic year following the student-athlete's initial full-time collegiate enrollment, the student-athlete has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 96 semester or 144 quarter units applicable toward a specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution the minimum number of semester or quarter units established pursuant to the Association's satisfactory-progress legislation. This provision shall be administered by the member conferences of the Association, or in the case of an independent institution, by the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee."

Source: All 10 members of the Big East Conference.

Rationale: This amendment-to-amendment would ensure that the academic standards established to permit a partial qualifier or nonqualifier to earn a fourth season of competition will reflect possible revisions of the Association's continuing-eligibility requirements

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 39-2 PARTIAL-QUALIFIER AND NONQUALIFIER ELIGIBILITY

Intent: To specify that Proposal No. 39 shall affect only those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1992.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 39, as follows:

[Division I only]

"Effective Date: August 1, 1992; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1988 August 1, 1992."

Source: All 10 members of the Big East Conference.

Rationale: The sponsors of Proposal No. 39 do not wish the proposal to affect any currently enrolled student-athletes.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

t d. Doorens-Is	/	A-63
egislative Proposals		

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

NO. 40 ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS FOR EARLY SIGNEES

Intent: To specify that a prospective student-athlete who signs a National Letter of Intent during the early signing period (i.e., in all sports other than football, women's volleyball, field hockey, soccer and water polo) shall not be eligible for practice or competition during the first academic year in residence at a Division I member institution if the prospect, at the time of the signing, does not present a minimum SAT score of 700 or ACT score of 17 and also does not present a minimum 2.000 grade-point average in at least seven core courses.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3 by adding new 14.3.6, page 135, as follows: [Division I only]

"14.3.6 Academic Requirements For Early Letter-of-Intent Signees. A prospective student-athlete with no previous full-time college attendance who signs a National Letter of Intent with a Division I institution during the early signing period shall not be eligible for practice or competition during the first academic year in residence unless the prospect, at the time of the signing, has presented the institution with a minimum combined SAT score of 700 or a minimum composite ACT score of 17 and also has presented a minimum 2.000 grade-point average in at least seven core courses (per 14.3.1.1.1)."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: This proposal will provide an incentive to prospective student-athletes to achieve academic credentials by the beginning of the senior year of high school that will give them a reasonable chance to become qualifiers prior to signing a National Letter of Intent during the early signing period. It also will permit member institutions to allocate recruiting funds more efficiently by establishing a more complete academic profile of prospective student-athletes who intend to sign a National Letter of Intent during the early signing period.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 40-1 ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS FOR EARLY SIGNEES

Intent: To delay the effective date of Proposal No. 40 by one year until August 1, 1993.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 40, as follows:

[Division I only]

"Effective Date: August 1, 1992 August 1, 1993."

Source: All 10 members of the Southland Conference; all nine members of the Western Athletic Conference; University of California, Irvine; University of California, Santa Barbara; California State University, Fresno; California State University, Fullerton; California State University, Long Beach; University of Nevada, Las Vegas; New Mexico State University; University of the Pacific (California), and Utah State University.

Rationale: Delaying the effective date of this proposal will establish more time for member institutions to evaluate prospective student-athletes who are potential early National Letter of Intent signees and to prepare for the financial implications of this legislation. It also will create additional time for prospects to obtain the necessary academic credentials.

Action: Withdrawn.

Eligibility

NO. 41 DRUG-TESTING CONSENT FORM

Intent: To permit member institutions to administer the drug-testing consent form separately from the Student-Athlete Statement, to require all student-athletes (per 12.02.6), including partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers and students who are fulfilling a transfer residence requirement or an injury-hardship waiver, to sign the drug-testing consent form on an annual basis; to specify that the consent form must be signed before the students may be eligible to participate (i.e., practice or compete) in intercollegiate athletics and to specify that all student-athletes listed on NCAA squad lists must have signed a drug-testing consent form.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.2.4 by adding new 3.2.4.6, page 10, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"3.2.4.6 Drug-Testing Consent Form. The active member shall administer annually, on a form prescribed by the Council, a signed drug-testing consent form for each student-athlete (per 12.02.6) pursuant to 14.01.4 and 30.5.

"3.2.4.6.1 Administrative Requirements. The consent form shall be administered individually to student-athletes each academic year at the time the intercollegiate squad first reports for practice or the first date on which classes are scheduled in the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first. The consent form shall be kept on file in the office of the director of athletics, and such file shall be available for examination upon request by an authorized representative of the NCAA. Failure to complete and sign the consent form

egislative Proposals	A-65
----------------------	------

shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation (i.e., practice and competition) in all intercollegiate athletics."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.01, pages 117-118, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14 01 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

[14.01.1 and 14.01.2 unchanged.]

"14.01 3 Student-Athlete Responsibility — Information Related to Eligibility. Prior to competing in intercollegiate athletics each year, the student-athlete shall sign a statement in a form prescribed by the Council (see 30.10) in which the student provides information on various aspects of eligibility, including those regulations identified in 14 01 4 14.01.5, as well as information about involvement in organized gambling activities concerning intercollegiate athletics competition under governing legislation of the Association. and in which the student consents to be tested for the use of drugs prohibited by NCAA legislation. Failure to complete and sign the statement annually shall result in the student-athlete's being ineligible for all intercollegiate athletics competition.

"14.01.4 Student-Athlete Responsibility — Drug-Testing Consent Form. Each academic year, the student-athlete shall sign a form prescribed by the Council (see 30.5) in which the student consents to be tested for the use of drugs prohibited by NCAA legislation."

[14.01.4, renumbered as 14.01.5, unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 14.1, pages 120-122, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.1 GENERAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

[14.1.1 and 14.1.2 unchanged.]

"14,1,3 Student-Athlete Statement

"14.1.3.1 Content and Purpose. Prior to participation in intercollegiate competition each academic year, the student-athlete shall sign a statement in a form prescribed by the Council in which the student-athlete submits information related to eligibility, recruitment, financial aid, amateur status and involvement in organized gambling activities related to intercollegiate athletics competition under the Association's governing legislation, and in which the individual consents to be tested for the use of drugs prohibited by NCAA legislation. Failure to complete and sign the statement shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition.

[14,1.3.2 unchanged.]

"14.1.4 Drug-Testing Consent Form.

"14.1.4.1 Content and Purpose. Each academic year the student-athlete shall sign a form pre-

te shall sign a form pre-

scribed by the Council in which the student consents to be tested for the use of drugs prohibited by NCAA legislation. Failure to complete and sign the consent form shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation (i.e., practice and competition) in all intercollegiate athletics.

"14.1.4.2 Administration. The institution shall administer the consent form individually to each student-athlete (including recruited partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers) each academic year. Details about the content, administration and disposition of the consent form are set forth in 30.5."

[14.1.4 through 14.1.7, renumbered as 14.1.5 through 14.1.8, unchanged]

D. Bylaws: Amend 15.5.8 by adding new 15.5.8.3, page 178, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15.5.8.3 Drug-Testing Consent-Form Requirement. Any student-athlete who signs a drug-testing consent form must be included on the institution's squad-list form, and any student-athlete who is included on the squad-list form must have signed a drug-testing consent form pursuant to 14.01.4."

E. Bylaws: Amend 30 by adding new 30.5, page 391, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

***30.5 DRUG-TESTING CONSENT FORM**

"The following procedures shall be used in administering the drug-testing consent form required in 14.1.4:

- "(a) The consent form shall be administered individually to each student-athlete by the director of athletics or the director of athletics' designee each academic year, and
- "(b) The statement shall be kept on file by the director of athletics and shall be available for examination upon request by an authorized representative of the NCAA."
- F. Bylaws: Amend 30.11, page 400, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"30.11 SQUAD LIST

"The following procedures shall be used in regard to the squad list required in 15.5.8.2:

[30.11-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Any student-athlete who signs a drug-testing consent form must be included on the institution's squad-list form, and any student-athlete who is included on the

egislative Proposals	
o the control of the	A-6

squad-list form must have signed a drug-testing consent form pursuant to 14.01.4."

[30.11-(b) and 30.11-(c), relettered as 30.11-(c) and 30.11-(d), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The timing of NCAA year-round drug testing necessical tates that the drug-testing consent form be administered and signed earlier than the Student-Athlete Statement. Further, it is necessary that all student-athletes eligible for selection for NCAA drug testing (currently, those listed on the institutional squad list) have executed the consent form prior to such selection.

Action: Parts A through C were adopted as amended by No. 41-1.5 Parts D and F were adopted by Divisions I and II. Part E was adopted.

NO. 41-1 DRUG-TESTING CONSENT FORM

Intent: To specify that the drug-testing consent form must be administered at the time the intercollegiate squad first reports for practice or prior to the Monday of the institution's fourth week of classes, whichever date occurs first.

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 41-A, 3.2.4.6.1, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"3.2.4.6.1 Administrative Requirements. The consent form shall be administered individually to student-athletes each academic year at the time the intercollegiate squad first reports for practice or the first date on which classes are scheduled in prior to the Monday of the institution's tall term fourth week of classes, whichever date occurs first. The consent form shall be kept on file in the office of the director of athletics, and such file shall be available for examination upon request by an authorized representative of the NCAA. Failure to complete and sign the consent form shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation (i.e., practice and competition) in all intercollegiate athletics."

Source: NCAA Council.

Rationale: This amendment-to-amendment will establish more flexibility for institutions to administer the drug-testing consent form in those sports that do not begin a playing segment prior to during the hectic first three weeks of classes.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 42 HARDSHIP WAIVER-DIVISION I

Intent: To permit a Division I student-athlete to be granted a hard-ship waiver based upon injury or illness that occurred during.

enrollment at a two-year college, subject to certain specified conditions.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.5, pages 125-127, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.2.5 Hardship Waiver. A student-athlete may be granted an additional year of competition by the conference or the Eligibility Committee for reasons of 'hardship.' Hardship is defined as an incapacity resulting from an injury or illness that has occurred under all of the following conditions:

"(a) The incapacitating injury or illness occurs in one of the four seasons of intercollegiate competition at any four-year collegiate institution, for members of Division I, or at any two-year or four-year collegiate institution, for members of Divisions II and III: and

[14.2.5-(b) and 14.2.5-(c) unchanged.]

"14.2.5.1 Additional Division I Criteria — Two-Year College Hardship. Division I institutions shall apply the following additional conditions if the injury or illness occurred at a two-year college:

- "(a) The appropriate two-year college athletics association (e.g., National Junior College Athletic Association, California Community College League) shall review and approve each 'hardship' waiver request;
- "(b) Subsequent to approval by the appropriate twoyear college athletics association, the request shall be reviewed and approved by the appropriate NCAA member conference or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee, to ensure compliance with the provisions of NCAA legislation;
- "(c) Waiver requests shall be submitted only from two-year college organizations that apply the same or more stringent rules related to the administration of hardship waivers (i.e., compliance with all of the regulations of Bylaw 14.2.5), and
- "(d) Each waiver request must be accompanied by a signed statement by the physician who treated the student-athlete, indicating the reason(s) why the injury or illness was incapacitating."

[14.2.5.1 and 14.2.5.2, renumbered as 14.2.5.2 and 14.2.5.3, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Two-Year College Relations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Currently, only Divisions II and III member institutions recognize hardship waivers related to injuries or illnesses that occurred at two-year colleges. The Two-Year College Relations Committee believes that this is not an equitable arrangement

egislative Proposals A-6	69
--------------------------	----

for Division I member institutions or for involved student-athletes. A student-athlete who is injured at a two-year college and receives a hardship waiver from the appropriate two-year college athletics association should have the same opportunity to compete in all NCAA divisions, including Division I, especially if the student-athlete has the athletics ability to participate at that level. Understanding the concerns for potential problems in this area, the committee proposes the safeguards listed in this proposal to ensure that the waiver procedures will be administered on an equal basis to all Division I institutions. In particular, the proposal calls for two-year colleges to apply the same standards for the administration of hardship waivers as those currently utilized by all NCAA member institutions. Further, this proposal requires that the conference or, in the case of an independent institution, the NCAA Eligibility Committee, review each waiver to ensure compliance with NCAA standards.

Action: Adopted by Division I as amended by No. 42-1

NO. 42-1 HARDSHIP WAIVER — DIVISION I

Intent: To specify that Proposal No. 42 will affect only those student-athletes who first enter a collegiate institution on or after August I, 1992.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 42, as follows:

[Division I only]

"Effective Date: Immediately August 1, 1992; for student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1992."

Source: NCAA Council.

Rationale: This amendment-to-amendment will allow two-year colleges a reasonable period of time to adjust to the new provisions regarding the hardship waiver and ensure that the extension of the waiver will apply on a more consistent basis to all student-athletes entering Division I member institutions from two-year colleges.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 43 HARDSHIP WAIVER

Intent: To exclude scrimmages and exhibition contests in the calculation of both the number of events in which a student-athlete has participated and the number of the institution's completed events in the administration of the hardship waiver.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.5, pages 125-127, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"14 2.5 Hardship Waiver. A student-athlete may be granted an additional year of competition by the conference or the Eligibility Committee for reasons of 'hardship.' Hardship is defined as an incapacity resulting from an injury or illness that has oc-

A-70 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

curred under all of the following conditions:

[14.2.5-(a) and 14.2.5-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) The injury or illness occurs when the student-athlete has not participated in more than two events or 20 percent (whichever number is greater) of the institution's completed events in his or her sport. Only competition (including a excluding scrimmages and exhibition contests) against outside participants during the traditional playing season, or, if so designated, during the official NCAA championship playing season in that sport (e.g., spring baseball, fall soccer), shall be countable under this limitation in calculating both the number of events in which the student-athlete has participated and the number of completed events during that season in the sport."

[Remainder of 14.2.5 unchanged.]

Source: All nine members of the Missouri Valley Conference; Loyola College (Maryland); Rutgers University, New Brunswick, and U.S. Military Academy.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal is intended to provide institutions appealing for a "hardship" waiver on behalf of student-athletes a more fair and consistent manner of calculating countable competition. Scrimmages are basically employed as opportunities for instruction and for fine tuning skills and occur primarily before the traditional playing season. Student-athletes participating in scrimmages primarily are working on the improvement of techniques, the execution of set plays and field maneuvers both individually and as a team rather than competing to score points for their respective institutions. The student's performance in such contests is not included in a team's record of wins and losses, nor are a student-athlete's accomplishments or statistics from such competition applied to his or her overall individual statistics. Play is often interrupted by coaches from both teams in order to make on-the-spot corrections and to teach skills to improve play. Thus, such scrimmages do not constitute true game competition as defined by NCAA rules and should not be calculated either in the number of events in which the student-athlete has participated or in the number of completed events during the "traditional season" in a sport pursuant to the "hardship" criteria.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II; defeated by Division III.

NO. 44 HARDSHIP WAIVER-DIVISION III

Intent: To permit student-athletes in Division III to qualify for an injury-hardship waiver if the injury or illness occurs when the student-athlete has not participated in more than four events or 40 percent of the institution's completed events.

Bylaws: Amend	14.2.5.	pages	125-127.	as	follows:
Divide the 't thinging	1.1.2.0,	Pugoc	, mo ,	~~	

egislative Proposals	 A-71
0	

[Division III only]

"14.2.5 Hardship Waiver. A student-athlete may be granted an additional year of competition by the conference or the Eligibility Committee for reasons of 'hardship.' Hardship is defined as an incapacity resulting from an injury or illness that has occurred under all of the following conditions:

[14.2.5-(a) and 14.2.5-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) The injury or illness occurs when the student-athlete has not participated in more than two events or 20 percent (whichever number is greater) of the institution's completed events in his or her sport for student-athletes in Divisions I and II and four events or 40 percent (whichever number is greater) of the institution's completed events in his or her sport for student-athletes in Division III. Only competition (including a scrimmage) against outside participants during the traditional playing season, or, if so designated, during the official NCAA championship playing season in that sport (e.g., spring baseball, fall soccer), shall be countable under this limitation in calculating both the number of events in which the student-athlete has participated and the number of completed events during that season in the sport.

[14.2.5.1 unchanged.]

"14.2.5.2 Criteria for Administration of Hardship Waiver. The following criteria are to be employed in the administration of the hardship waiver:

[14.2.5.2.1 through 14.2.5.2.3 unchanged.]

"14.2.5.2.4 Twenty Percent Calculations. The following requirements are to be met in determining the 20 percent calculations under this waiver provision: [Note. The 20 percent calculation requirements set forth in 14.2.5 and 14.2.5.2.4 apply only to the waiver provisions of this section and do not apply to the maximum- and minimum-contests requirements in Bylaws 17 and 20.]

"14.2.5.2.4.1 Denominator in 20 Percent Computations. The denominator in the institution's 20 percent calculation shall be based on the institution's number of completed varsity events.

"14.2.5.2.4.2 Fraction in 20 Percent Computations. Any computation of the 20 percent limitation that results in a fractional portion of an event shall be rounded to the next whole number (e.g., 20 percent of a 27-game basketball schedule—5.4 games—shall be considered six games)."

[Remainder of 14.2.5 unchanged.]

Source: All 26 members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

A-72 _____

______1992 Convention Proceedings

Rationale: The current hardship restriction of 20 percent or less is too restrictive for the Division III level of competition. It appears unfair to deny a student-athlete the right to participate in an extra traditional season if he or she has played in two or more football games in a 10-game season (e.g., injured in first minute of third game), or seven softball games in a 34-game season, especially when that student-athlete is not receiving athletically-based financial aid. At first glance, some might argue that there could be abuses by coaches, but keep in mind that the student-athlete has to attend school for that extra semester and is paying significant amounts of money to do so. The Division III philosophy is participation. This proposal seems to fit reasonably and realistically in that philosophy.

Action: Adopted by Division III as amended by No. 44-1.

NO. 44-1 HARDSHIP WAIVER — DIVISION III

Intent: To permit student-athletes in Division III to qualify for an injury-hardship waiver if the injury or illness occurs when the student-athlete has not participated in more than three events or one-third of the institution's completed events.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 44, 14.2.5, as follows:

[Division III only]

"14.2.5 Hardship Waiver. A student-athlete may be granted an additional year of competition by the conference or the Eligibility Committee for reasons of 'hardship.' Hardship is defined as an incapacity resulting from an injury or illness that has occurred under all of the following conditions:

[14.2.5-(a) and 14.2.5-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) The injury or illness occurs when the student-athlete has not participated in more than two events or 20 percent (whichever number is greater) of the institution's completed events in his or her sport for student-athletes in Divisions I and II and four three events or 40 percent one-third (whichever number is greater) of the institution's completed events in his or her sport for student-athletes in Division III. Only competition (including a scrimmage) against outside participants during the traditional playing season, or, if so designated, during the official NCAA championship playing season in that sport (e.g., spring baseball, fall soccer), shall be countable under this limitation in calculating both the number of events in which the student-athlete has participated and the number of completed events during that season in the sport."

[Remainder of 14.2.5 unchanged.]

Sou	rce:	Franklin and Marshall College, Gettysburg College, Haver-
	lord	College, Juniata College, Lebanon Valley College, Muhlen.
:	berg	College, University of Scranton and Widener University.

Rationale: There is general agreement that the current hardship

I am alasta Daniel I				
Legislative Proposals		7	"	
g	 ^	-/	.7	

waiver rule is too restrictive for Division III. Many institutions would like to see a relaxation of that rule, but feel a 40-percent standard is too liberal. The establishment of a one-third rule is a compromise that we can all live with.

Action: Adopted by Division III.

NO. 45 OUTSIDE COMPETITION — DIVISION II

Intent: In Division II, to eliminate restrictions on outside competition during the academic year following the conclusion of the playing season.

Bylaws: Amend 14.8.1.1 and 14.8.1.2, page 150, as follows:
[Division II only]

"14.8.1.1 Divisions I and II. In Divisions I and II, a student-athlete in any sport other than basketball who participates during the academic year as a member of any outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition except while representing the institution in intercollegiate competition in accordance with the permissible playing season in that sport as specified in Bylaw 17 becomes ineligible for intercollegiate competition in that sport for the remainder of the year and for the next academic year (see 14.8.5 and 14.8.6 for exceptions and waivers).

"14.8.1.2 Divisions II and III. A Division II or III student-athlete shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition for the remainder of the season in his or her sport (other than basketball) if, following enrollment in college and during any year in which the student-athlete is a member of an intercollegiate squad or team, he or she competes or has competed as a member of any outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., tournament play, exhibition games or other activity) during the institution's intercollegiate season in the sport (see 14.8.5) and 14.8.6 for exceptions and waivers)."

Source: All eight members of the California Collegiate Athletic Association.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The California Collegiate Athletic Association believes that 14.8.1.1 is not necessary in Division II and that its effect could be very harmful to Division II competition. Funding at the majority of Division II schools in the sports involved is limited, and the competition in which the student-athlete is involved outside the institution certainly increases the student-athlete's athletics potential.

Action: Defeated by Division II (97-101, one abstention); motion to reconsider defeated (86-102, two abstentions).

NO. 45-1 OUTSIDE COMPETITION — DIVISION II

[Note: Upon the recommendation of the parliamentarian, the chair intends to rule amendment-to-amendment No. 45-1 out of order. The sponsors have asked that the proposal be circulated in

order to challenge the chair's ruling.]

Intent: To preclude the outside participation of Division II studentathletes only during the traditional playing segment.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 45, 14.8.1.2, as follows:

[Division II only]

"14.8.1.2 Divisions II and III. A Division II or III student-athlete shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition for the remainder of the season in his or her sport (other than basketball) if, following enrollment in college and during any year in which the student-athlete is a member of an intercollegiate squad or team, he or she competes or has competed as a member of any outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., tournament play, exhibition games or other activity) during the institution's traditional playing segment in the sport in Division II and during the institution's intercollegiate season in Division III in the sport (see 14.8.5 and 14.8.6 for exceptions and waivers)."

Source: All eight members of the California Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order.

NO. 46 OUTSIDE COMPETITION

Intent: To permit student-athletes from institutions that do not sponsor a nontraditional segment in their sport to compete in noncollegiate outside competition during the academic year.

Bylaws: Amend 14.8.1.1 by adding new 14.8.1.1.1, page 150, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.8.1.1.1 Exception. Student-athletes from member institutions that do not sponsor nontraditional seasons in their sport may participate as members of noncollegiate outside teams during the academic year outside the traditional playing season, provided:

- "(a) The number of student-athletes from any one member institution on an outside team does not exceed the limits set forth in 17.23.2, and
- "(b) A student-athlete's combined participation during the intercollegiate season and in noncollegiate outside team activities does not exceed a total of 22 weeks in team sports or 24 weeks (or 144 days) in individual sports during the academic year."

Source: Adelphi University; Campbell University; University of Evansville; Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck; Quincy College, St. Louis University; St. Mary's College (California), and Seton Hall University.

Effective	Date:	Immediately
-----------	-------	-------------

egislative Proposals		
-3		Α.΄

Rationale: Recent NCAA legislation forbidding student-athletes from competing on outside teams during the academic year is counterproductive at those institutions that do not sponsor nontraditional seasons. The intent of the legislation was to reduce the time commitment of student-athletes, but time demands will actually be increased when institutions conduct nontraditional seasons in order to provide competition opportunities that student-athletes previously provided for themselves. An institution that previously did not conduct a nontraditional season now will have additional staffing, facility, equipment and transportation costs.

Action: Defeated by Division I; defeated by Division II (92-104, three abstentions). Motion to reconsider in Division II was defeated.

NO. 47 AMATEURISM — CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

- Intent: To permit an individual to request information about his or her professional market value; to permit an individual, his or her legal guardians or the institution's professional sports counseling panel to negotiate with a professional sports organization without the loss of the individual's amateur status, and to specify that an individual who retains an agent to negotiate with a professional sports organization loses amateur status.
- A. Bylaws: Amend 12.2.4 by adding new 12.2.4.3, page 71, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"12.2.4.3 Negotiations. An individual may request information about professional market value without affecting his or her amateur status. Further, the individual, his or her legal guardians or the institution's professional sports counseling panel may enter into negotiations with a professional sports organization without the loss of the individual's amateur status. An individual who retains an agent shall lose amateur status."

B. Bylaws: Amend 12.2.5.1, page 71, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]
"12.2.5.1 General Rule. An individual shall be ineligible for participation in an intercollegiate sport if he or she has entered into any kind of agreement to compete in professional athletics or to negotiate a professional contract in that sport, regardless of the legal en-

forceability of that agreement."
[Remainder of 12.2.5.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: A student-athlete should have the right to determine his or her market value for professional athletics without jeopardizing eligibility for intercollegiate athletics in that sport. Currently, a student-athlete loses amateur status in that sport by enter-

ing into negotiations with a professional organization; however, students in extracurricular activities other than athletics (e.g., art or drama) may learn their market value in their particular field and negotiate contract terms without jeopardizing their status at the university. Allowing a student-athlete to negotiate with a professional organization would place all contract discussions with professional organizations above reproach. This proposal would allow the student-athlete, his or her guardians or the institution's professional sports counseling panel to enter into negotiations; thus, the student-athlete would be permitted to receive advice from individuals interested in the well-being of the student-athlete. This proposal is not intended to have particular impact upon any professional organization; instead, it is intended for the benefit of the involved student-athlete.

Action: Part A adopted by all three divisions after a motion to refer for further study was defeated. Part B was adopted by all three divisions.

NO. 48 TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY — DIVISION III

Intent: To use Division III eligibility rules when determining whether a transfer student would have been academically eligible had he or she remained at the previous institution.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.6.1.1, page 141, as follows:
[Division III only]

"14.6.1.1 Division III Exception. A student who has not previously participated in intercollegiate athletics and who transfers from a two-year or four-year collegiate institution to a Division III member institution shall be immediately eligible, under the Association's transfer regulations, to compete for the Division III institution, including NCAA championship competition. If the student has ever participated in intercollegiate athletics, the student must have been academically eligible under the eligibility rules of the certifying Division III institution had he or she remanced been enrolled at that institution."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.6.5.3.11, page 149, as follows: [Division III only]

"14.6.5.3.11 Division III Exception. The student never had participated in intercollegiate athletics prior to transferring to the certifying institution or the student transfers to the certifying institution, and the student would have been academically eligible under the eligibility rules of the certifying Division III institution had he or she remained been enrolled at the that institution from which the student transferred."

Source. All 26 members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: It was the intent of Division III to enable academically

egislative Proposals	 A-77
egislatīve Proposals	 A-7.

sound students to transfer and be immediately eligible at the new institution. A flaw in the current new legislation prevents this in some cases. An example: "Jane" goes to a Division I member institution and plays a fall sport. She earns a 3.500 gradepoint average but withdraws from school at the end of the fall term because her mother dies and she is needed at home. She does not attend any college in the spring. She now enrolls at a Division III member institution in the fall. The current rules render her ineligible because she did not pass 24 credits in the year preceding the fall season, despite her excellent academic record. Yes, she could use the missed-term exception to satisfactory progress, but why should she be forced to use it in this situation?

Action: Defeated by Division III.

Personnel

NO. 49 RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH

Intent: To permit a restricted-earnings coach to receive compensation without limitation from the athletics department for performing duties not related to coaching.

Bylaws: Amend 11.02.3, page 49, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.02.3 Restricted-Earnings Coach. A restricted-earnings coach is any coach who is designated by the institution's athletics department to perform coaching duties and who serves in that capacity on a volunteer or paid basis with the following limitations on earnings derived from the member institution:

"(a) During the academic year, a restricted-earnings coach may receive compensation or remuneration for coaching duties from the institution's athletics department that is not in excess of either \$12,000 or the actual cost of educational expenses incurred as a graduate student,

[11.02.3-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) During the summer or the academic year, the restrictedearnings coach may receive compensation for performing duties other than coaching from the athletics department or another department or office of the institution, provided:

"(1) The compensation received for those **non-coaching** duties outside the athletics department is commensurate with that received by others performing those same or similar assignments,

[11 02.3-(c)-(2) unchanged.]

"(3) The individual is qualified for and is performing the non-coaching duties outside the athletics department for which the individual is compensated and a written

description of the non-coaching duties is on file in the office of the director of athletics."

Source: Boston College, Brown University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, University of Maine, Northeastern University, Providence College and Yale University.

FF Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: If an individual can work at another legitimate job outside the athletics department, it should be permissible for the individual to work at a legitimate job within the athletics department if such work is documented and the compensation is commensurate with the work performed.

Action: Defeated by Division I

NO. 49-1 RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH

Intent: To permit one restricted-earnings coach in a men's sport (other than football and basketball) and one restricted-earnings coach in a women's sport (other than basketball) to receive compensation from the athletics department for the performance of noncoaching duties during the academic year.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 49, 11.02.3, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.02.3 Restricted-Earnings Coach. A restricted-earnings coach is any coach who is designated by the institution's athletics department to perform coaching duties and who serves in that capacity on a volunteer or paid basis with the following limitations on earnings derived from the member institution:

[11.02.3-(a) and 11.02.3-(b) unchanged.]

- "(c) During the summer or the academic year, the restrictedearnings coach may receive compensation for performing duties other than coaching from the athletics department or another a department or office of the institution other than the athletics department, provided:
 - [11.02.3-(c)-(1) and 11.02.3-(c)-(2) unchanged.]
 - "(3) The individual is qualified for and is performing the noncoaching duties for which the individual is compensated and a written description of the noncoaching duties is on file in the office of the director of athletics.
- "(d) During the academic year in sports other than football and men's and women's basketball, one restricted-earnings coach in a men's sport and one restrictedearnings coach in a women's sport may receive compensation or remuneration from the athletics department for performing duties other than coaching provided:
 - "(1) The compensation received for those noncoaching duties is commensurate with that received by others performing those same or similar assignments;

Legislative Proposals A	7	70
-------------------------	---	----

- "(2) The ratio of compensation received for coaching duties and other duties is directly proportionate to the amount of time devoted to the two areas of assignment, and
- "(3) The individual actually is qualified for and is performing the noncoaching duties for which the individual is compensated, and a written description of the noncoaching duties is on file in the office of the athletics director."

Source: Brown University, Colgate University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, University of Maine, Providence College and University of Vermont.

Rationale: This amendment will provide limited flexibility for member institutions to permit one restricted-earnings coach in a men's sports and one restricted-earnings coach in a women's, sport (other than football and basketball) to receive compensation from the athletics department for the performance of noncoaching duties during the academic year.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 50 RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH

Intent: To exempt from the \$4,000 summer-earnings limitation ap plicable to restricted-earnings coaches compensation and remuneration from the institution's camp or clinic, camps or clinics owned or operated by institutional employees, or another institution's summer camp.

Bylaws: Amend 11.02.3, page 49, as follows: [Division I only]

"11.02.3 Restricted-Earnings Coach. A restricted-earnings coach is any coach who is designated by the institution's athletics department to perform coaching duties and who serves in that capacity on a volunteer or paid basis with the following limitations. on earnings derived from the member institution:

[11.02.3-(a) unchanged.]

- "(b) During the summer, a restricted-earnings coach may receive compensation or remuneration (total remuneration shall not exceed \$4,000) from the institution's athletics department that is not in excess of \$4,000. There are no restrictions on earnings derived from camps or clinics during the summer, including an institution's camp or clinic.
 - "(1) The institution's athletics department,
 - "(2) The institution's camp or clinic,
 - "(3) Camps or clinics owned or operated by institutional employees, or
 - "(4) Another member institution's summer camp."

[Remainder of 11.02 3 unchanged.]

Source: All nine members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

1992 Convention Proceedings A-80

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current rule prohibiting restricted-earnings coaches from receiving compensation and remuneration during the summer in excess of \$4,000 from the institution's camp or clinic, camps or clinics owned or operated by institutional employees, or another institution's summer camp impacts greatly the ability of many coaches to earn enough money to remain in the profession. By restricting the summer salary limitation of \$4,000 to compensation or remuneration from the institution, a coach would be able to earn additional money from camps or clinics.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A.

NO. 51 COACHING LIMITATIONS — DIVISION I-A

Intent: To establish a coaching limitation in Division I-A football of one head coach, nine assistant coaches and two graduate assistant coaches instead of one head coach, eight assistant coaches and four restricted-earnings coaches.

Bylaws: Amend 11.02 by adding new 11.02.4, page 49, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"11.02.4 Coach, Graduate Assistant. A graduate assistant coach is any coach who has received a baccalaureate degree and is a graduate student enrolled in at least 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular graduate program of studies and qualifies for appointment as a graduate assistant under the policies of the institution. The individual is not required to be enrolled in a specific graduate degree program unless required by institutional policy. The following provisions shall apply:

"(a) The individual may not receive compensation or remuneration in excess of the value of a full grant-inaid for a full-time student, based on the resident status of that individual, and the receipt of four complimentary tickets to the institution's intercollegiate football and basketball games;

"(b) Graduate and postgraduate financial assistance administered outside the institution (e.g., NCAA postgraduate scholarship) shall be excluded from the individual's limit on remuneration, provided such assistance is awarded through an established and continuing program to aid graduate students and the donor of the assistance does not restrict the recipient's choice of institutions:

"(c) The individual may not serve as a graduate assistant coach for a period of more than two years unless the Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, approves a waiver of this two-year limitation based on the fact that the student's service

	A-81
egislative Proposals	

as a coach and enrollment as a graduate student were interrupted for reasons that are unrelated to athletics, or to personal or family finances, and that are beyond the control of the institution or the coach. Such a waiver may not be granted solely to permit the completion of a graduate program;

"(d) Compensation for employment from a source outside the institution during the academic year shall be excluded from the individual's limit on remuneration, provided the institution does not arrange such employment and the compensation is for work actually performed. The member institution may not arrange on or off-campus employment opportunities except for summer employment, which is permissible regardless of whether the student remains enrolled in the graduate program over the summer;

"(e) The individual may receive only those expenses incurred on road trips that are received by individual team members and only those expenses incurred in scouting opponents that are received by individual coaches. However, a graduate student coach may accept employment benefits available to all institutional employees (e.g., life insurance, health insurance, disability insurance), as well as expenses to attend the conventions of the national coaches associations in football, without the value of those benefits being computed;

"(f) The institution may provide actual and necessary expenses for the individual's spouse and children to attend a certified postseason football game or an NCAA championship in the sport of football, and

"(g) The individual may not evaluate or contact prospective student-athletes off campus, regardless of whether compensation is received for such activities."

B. Bylaws: Amend 11.7.2, page 62, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"11.7.2 Division I-A Football. There shall be a limit of nine one head coach, or nine assistant coaches and tour restricted-earnings two graduate assistant coaches that may be employed by the institution in the sport of Division I-A football.

[11.7.2.1 and 11.7.2.2 unchanged.]

"11.7 2 3 Combination Option. A member institution may combine two restrictedearnings positions into one coaching position. Such a coach may receive compensation or remuneration that is not in excess of \$24,000 from the institution's athletics department during the academic year and not in excess of \$8,000 [from the sources listed in 11.02.3-(b)] during the summer. The coach shall be subject to all other restrictions applicable to a restricted-earnings coach." Source: Colorado State University; University of Florida; University of Georgia; Georgia Institute of Technology; Louisiana State University; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Oklahoma State University; Rice University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: This proposal could reduce expenditures and will maintain maximum institutional control and accountability more effectively than the 1-8-4 coaching limitation adopted at the 1991 Convention.

Action: Adopted by Division I-A.

NO. 52 RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH — COMBINATION OPTION

Intent: To permit institutions to combine three or four restricted-earnings positions into one coaching position in Division I-A football.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.2.3, page 62, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"11.7.2.3 Combination Option. A member institution may combine two, three or four restricted-earnings positions into one coaching position. Such a coach may receive compensation or remuneration that is not in excess of \$24,000 (if two positions are combined into one), \$36,000 (if three positions are combined into one), or \$48,000 (if four positions are combined into one) from the institution's athletics department during the academic year and not in excess of \$8,000 (if two positions are combined into one), \$12,000 (if three positions are combined into one) or \$16,000 (if four positions are combined into one) from the sources listed in 11.02.3-(b)] during the summer. The coach shall be subject to all other restrictions applicable to a restricted-earnings coach."

Source: All nine members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The current rule permits institutions some flexibility by allowing the combining of two restricted-earnings coaches into one coaching position. This proposal would create greater flexibility by permitting institutions to combine three or four positions into one. Individual institutions would be provided the opportunity to determine the optimum method of utilizing the legislated salaries allocated for restricted-earnings coaches.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No. 51, Part B.

NO. 53 RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACHES — VARSITY/JUNIOR VARSITY PROGRAM

Intent: To permit Division I-AA institutions that sponsor both varsity and junior varsity football programs to employ two additional

egislatīve Proposals		A-83
SERRORIVE L'ADDITION	<u></u>	

restricted-earnings coaches.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.3.1, by adding new 11.7.3.1.5, page 63, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"11.7.3.1.5 Varsity/Junior Varsity Football Program. A Division I-AA member institution that conducts a football program that includes a varsity team and a junior varsity team may employ two additional restricted-earnings coaches. The institution's junior varsity team must participate in at least four intercollegiate contests in order for the two additional restricted-earnings coaches to be employed. Such additional restricted-earnings coaches may perform football-related duties only during the permissible playing and practice season in the sport of football;"

Source: All eight members of the Ivy Group, Bucknell University, Colgate University, Fordham University, College of the Holy Cross, Lafayette College and Lehigh University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: This proposal will retain an option that currently permits additional on-campus coaching for institutions with bona fide junior varsity teams and schedules.

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA.

NO. 54 RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACHES — DIVISION I-AA

Intent: To permit Division I-AA institutions to employ an unlimited in number of restricted-earnings coaches, provided the total remuneration provided to such coaches does not exceed the current compensation limitations applicable to restricted-earnings coaches.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.3 by adding new 11.7.3.1.5, page 63, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"11.7.3.1.5 Unlimited Restricted-Earnings Coaches Option."
A member institution may employ an unlimited number of restricted-earnings coaches, provided the total remuneration received by any one restricted-earnings coached does not exceed the limitations set forth in 11.02.3 and the total remuneration received by all coaches in combination is not in excess of \$24,000 from the institution's athletics department during the academic year and not in excess of \$8,000 [from sources listed in 11.02.3-(b)] during the summer. Such coaches shall be subject to all other restrictions applicable to restricted-earnings coaches."

Source: All nine members of the Southern Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

24	 1992 Convention Proceed
54	

Rationale: Currently a number of Division I-AA member institutions make up for a lack of full-time coaches through the use of volunteer coaches. This legislation would allow an institution to use multiple volunteer or graduate assistant coaches, provided the current financial limitation is maintained.

Action: Defeated by Division I-AA (38-55). Motion to reconsider was defeated (46-47).

NO. 55 RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH — DIVISION I-AA

Intent: To permit institutions to combine two restricted-earnings positions into one coaching position in Division I-AA football.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.3 by adding new 11.7.3.3, page 63, as follows:
[Division I-AA football only]

"11.7.3.3 Combination Option. A member institution may combine two restricted-earnings positions into one coaching position. Such a coach may receive compensation or remuneration that is not in excess of \$24,000 from the institution's athletics department during the academic year and not in excess of \$8,000 [from the sources listed in 11.02.3-(b)] during the summer. The coach shall be subject to all other restrictions applicable to a restricted-earnings coach."

Source: All nine members of the Southern Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: This proposal would create for Division I-AA member institutions the same opportunity available in Division I-A. It would allow each Division I-AA institution additional flexibility in the arrangement of staff without creating additional costs.

Action: Defeated by Division I-AA (40-53).

NO. 56 COACHING LIMITATIONS — ICE HOCKEY

Intent: To permit a member institution to employ three full-time coaches and no restricted-earnings coaches in the sport of ice hockey.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.4, pages 63-64, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.7.4 Sports Other Than Football. There shall be a limit on the number of coaches that may be employed by an institution in each sport (other than football) as follows:

	Head or	Restricted
	Assistant	Earnings
"Sport	Coach	Coach
"Ice Hockey	23	1 O"

[Remainder of 11.7.4 unchanged.]

Source: Colorado College; University of Denver; Michigan State
--

egislative Proposals	A-85
egisiaive r roposus	W-07

University; University of Minnesota, Duluth; University of North Dakota; Northern Michigan University; St. Cloud State University, and University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992

Rationale. To guarantee the safety and welfare of student-athletes and to ensure a productive practice and game environment, the sport of ice hockey needs three full-time, experienced coaches. A high-velocity contact sport such as ice hockey should have a player-coach ratio that does not exceed 12:1. This proposal will ensure that the athletes are properly coached and supervised during the course of the playing season and the recruiting periods.

Action: Defeated by Division I (88-155).

NO. 57 COACHING LIMITATIONS -- WRESTLING

Intent: To permit a member institution to employ two full-time coaches in the sport of wrestling.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.4, pages 63-64, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.7.4 Sports Other Than Football. There shall be a limit on the number of coaches that may be employed by an institution in each sport (other than football) as follows:

Head or RestrictedAssistant Earnings
Coach Coach
1 2 1"

[Remainder of 11.7.4 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Subcommittee to Review 1991 Reform Proposals); Lehigh University; University of Northern Iowa; University of Oregon; Pennsylvania State University; Stanford University; West Virginia University; University of Wisconsin, Madison, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

"Sport

"Wrestling

Rationale: At the 1991 Convention, wrestling was reduced to one full-time and one restricted-earnings coach. This staff limitation groups wrestling with several individual sports that do not share either the numbers of student-athletes or the physical elements of wrestling. While wrestling can be considered an individual sport, and therefore akin to tennis, golf, rifle or fencing, it also has many elements of a team sport. The number of student-athletes involved in competition at a given time is at least 10 and sometimes more, and the number involved in practice and training sometimes reaches 50-60. The national average number of student-athletes in wrestling is 24.4 per institution in Division I.

When recruiting or other off-campus duties necessitate one of the two coaches (allowable under Bylaw 11.7.4) to be off campus, the remaining coach cannot safely manage the activities of 20 to

60 student-athletes. In the interest of equitable coach/athlete ratios and in the interest of safety, this amendment to establish coaching staff limits at two full-time coaches and one restricted earnings coach is proposed. The additional coach will reduce the risks of injury in the practice facility and allow for adequate supervision and coaching in tournament situations.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 58 ADDITIONAL RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACHES

Intent: To permit member institutions with junior varsity sports programs in sports other than football that meet one-half of the minimum contest requirements established in Bylaw 20.9.3.3 to employ two additional restricted-earnings coaches in those sports.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.4.1 by adding new 11.7.4.1.5, page 64, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.7.4.1.5 Additional Restricted-Earnings Coaches — Junior Varsity Sports. Institutions with junior varsity programs that meet one-half of the sport-specific minimum contest requirements for sports sponsorship (per 20.9.3.3) may employ two additional restricted-earnings coaches who shall be prohibited from recruiting off campus in those sports."

Source: Brown University, Bucknell University, Colgate University, Fordham University, College of the Holy Cross, Lafayette College, Lehigh University and U.S. Military Academy.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: This proposal would provide member institutions with legitimate junior varsity programs the opportunity to hire additional restricted-earnings coaches to help with coaching duties in those sports.

, Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 59 RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACHES

Intent: To permit Division I member institutions in sports other than football to reapportion one assistant coaching position into two restricted-earnings positions and to specify that such coaches are subject to specific compensation and recruiting limitations similar to those applicable to restricted-earnings coaches.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.4 by adding new 11.7.4.3, page 64, as follows:
[Division I only]

"11.7.4.3 Reapportion Option. A member institution may reapportion one assistant coaching position in any sport other than football into two restricted-earnings positions

00	islative Proposals	; <u> </u>	A-87

in that sport. The coach shall be subject to all other restrictions applicable to a restricted-earnings coach."

Source: Bucknell University; Fordham University; College of the. Holy Cross; Lafayette College; Lehigh University; Loyola College (Maryland); Rutgers University, New Brunswick, and United States Military Academy.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This amendment will provide member institutions the opportunity and flexibility to develop and organize their coaching staffs to fit individual philosophies and needs by utilizing the cost-containment limitations set forth in Bylaw 11.02.3 (restricted-earnings coach) and by limiting to two the number of such additional coaches to be employed in each sport other than football. At the same time, it will further encourage the development of new coaches while effectively maintaining the established compensation limitations for such coaches.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 59-1 RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACHES

Intent: To specify that a Division I member institution shall not reapportion one assistant coaching position into two restricted-earnings positions in the sport of basketball.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 59, 11.7.4.3, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.7.4.3 Reapportion Option. A member institution may reapportion one assistant coaching position in any sport other than football and basketball into two restricted-earnings positions in that sport. The coach shall be subject to all other restrictions applicable to a restricted-earnings coach."

Source: All eight members of the Patriot League, Loyola College (Maryland) and Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 60 COACHING LIMITATIONS — VOLUNTEER COACH

Intent: To redefine a volunteer coach as specified and to permit Division I institutions (in sports other than football and basketball) to utilize the services of one volunteer coach.

A. Bylaws: Amend 11.02 by adding new 11.02.5, page 49, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.02.5 Coach, Volunteer. A volunteer coach is a coach who is prohibited from contacting and evaluating prospective student-athletes off campus or from scouting opponents off campus and who does not receive compensation or remuneration from the institution's athletics department except for a maximum of two complimentary

tickets to home athletics contests. A volunteer coach may receive compensation from outside the athletics department for performing duties for another department or office of the institution, provided:

"(a) The compensation received for those duties is commensurate with that received by others performing those same or similar assignments;

"(b) The time devoted to those duties is consistent with the time devoted by others receiving commensurate compensation for the same or similar assignments,

"(c) The individual is qualified for and is performing the duties for which the individual is compensated."

B. Bylaws: Amend 11.7.4.1, page 64, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.7.4.1 Exceptions to Number Limits. No individual other than coaches designated to fill the coaching categories set forth in 11.7.4 may participate in any manner in the coaching of the intercollegiate team of a member institution during any game, practice or other organized activity, with the following exceptions:

[11.7.4.1.1 and 11.7.4.1.2 unchanged.]

"11.7.4.1.3 Volunteer Coach. In sports other than football and basketball, a member institution may utilize the services of one volunteer coach (per 11.02.5). Indoor track, outdoor track and cross country are separate sports for purposes of this provision. In sports in which the NCAA conducts separate men's and women's championships, a combined men's and women's program may utilize two volunteer coaches."

[11.7.4.1.3 and 11.7.4.1.4 renumbered as 11.7.4.1.4 and 11.7.4.1.5, unchanged]

Source: NCAA Council (Subcommittee to Review 1991 Reform Proposals).

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale. At the 1991 Convention, the membership established coaching limits in Division I sports other than football and basketball for the first time. In response to the new limitations, many institutions expressed concern that a group of unpaid volunteers, such as former student-athletes and local club coaches, would be precluded from coaching and providing assistance to student-athletes. This proposal would permit each sport other than football and basketball the use of one volunteer coach who is restricted to on-campus activities and may not travel with the team. The establishment of a volunteer coach also would not result in any significant additional costs to the institution.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

ve Proposals _

SCOUTING OF OPPONENTS NO. 61

Intent: In Division III, to preclude the scouting of any opponents other than those participating in official games (not scrimmages. or exhibition contests) played during the traditional segment of the playing season.

Bylaws: Amend 11.6, page 57, as follows:

[Division III only]

"11.6 LIMITATIONS ON SCOUTING OF OPPONENTS

"11.6.1 Divisions II and III. There are no restrictions on scouting of opponents by institutions in Division II and Division III.

[11.6.2 unchanged.]

"11.6.3 Division III Restrictions. In Division III, member institutions shall not scout any opponents other than those participating in official games (not scrimmages or exhibition contests) played during the traditional segment of the playing season."

Source: All 26 members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: It is appropriate to limit scouting to actual games (not scrimmages or exhibition contests) in the traditional season.

Action: Adopted by Division III.

Financial Aid

MAXIMUM AWARDS — DIVISION I **EQUIVALENCY SPORTS - WOMEN**

Intent: To delay the effective date of 1991 Convention Proposal No. 40 regarding the reduction of the number of grant-in-aid limitations in women's equivalency sports from August 1, 1993, to August 1, 1994.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3 1, page 173, as follows:

[Division I only]

"15.5.3.1 Division I Maximum Equivalency Limits. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15 02.3.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the following Division I sports:

"Women's Sports:

"Women's Sports:	
"Cross Country/Track14.4	Skiing 6.3
Fencing4.5	Soccer9.9
Field Hockey9.9	Softball9.9 Swimming12.6"
Golf5.4	Swimming12.0
Lacrosse9.9	

1992 Convention Proceedings

Source: All 11 members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993 August 1, 1994

Rationale: The Council has forwarded a resolution to the Committee on Women's Athletics to conduct a comprehensive study on gender equity. The proposed delay in effective dates for women's programs is to allow a more reasonable time frame in which to study the results of the survey and to develop amendments based on the impact of grant-in-aid reductions in women's programs.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 63 MAXIMUM AWARDS — DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL

Intent: To delay the effective date of 1991 Convention Proposal No. 40 regarding the reduction of the number of grant-in-aid limitations in women's basketball from August 1, 1992, to August 1, 1993.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.4.1, page 175, as follows:

[Division I only]

"15.5.4.1 Division I. There shall be an annual limit of 14 during the 1992-93 academic year and 13 during the 1993-94 academic year and thereafter on the total number of counters in the sport of men's basketball and an annual limit of 14 during the 1993-94 academic year and 13 during the 1994-95 academic year and thereafter on the total number of counters in the sport of women's basketball at each Division I institution."

Source: All 11 members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992 August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The Council has forwarded a resolution to the Committee on Women's Athletics to conduct a comprehensive study on gender equity. The proposed delay in effective dates for women's programs is to allow a more reasonable time frame in which to study the results of the survey and to develop amendments based on the impact of grant-in-aid reductions in women's programs.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 64 MAXIMUM AWARDS — DIVISION II

Intent: To reduce the number of permissible grants-in-aid in selected Division II sports by 10 percent with a graduated two-year reduction in football and basketball.

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.2, page 174, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"15.5.3.2 Division II Maximum Equivalency Limits. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.3.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in each Division II sport, as follows:

Legislative Proposals		A-9
Legiallitie I roponium.		

"Men's Sports:

 $40\,38$ for the 1993-94 academic year and 36 for "Football the 1994-95 academic year and thereafter."

[Remainder of 15.5.3.2 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.2, page 174, as follows:

[Division II only]

"15.5.3.2 Division II Maximum Equivalency Limits. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.3.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in each Division II sport, as follows:

"Men's Sports:

"Basketball 12 11 for the 1993-94 academic year and 10 for the 1994-95 academic year and thereafter.

"Women's Sports:

"Basketball 12 11 for the 1993-94 academic year and 10 for the 1994-95 academic year and thereafter."

[Remainder of 15.5.3.2 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.2, page 174, as follows:

[Division II only]

"15.5.3.2 Division II Maximum Equivalency Limits. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.3.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in each Division II sport, as follows:

"Mon's Sports

"Men's Sports. "Baseball	Skiing 7 6.3 Soccer 10 9 Swimming 9 8.1 Tennis 5 4.5 Volleyball 5 4.5 Water Polo 5 4.5 Wrestling 10 9
"Women's Sports: "Cross Country/Track	Skiing

[Remainder of 15.5.3.2 unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the Lone Star Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: In addition to the need for Division II institutions to lower costs, these grant-in-aid reductions are required to establish Division II limits in proportion to Division I. In 1993-94, without these proposed reductions, 14 out of 30 sports will have more grants-in-

______1992 Convention Proceedings

aid available in Division II than in Division I. An additional seven sports will have a difference of one or less grants-in-aid between Divisions I and II, and any financial aid limit distinction between the two divisions will have virtually disappeared.

Action: Adopted by Division II (116-74, one abstention), after motion for a roll-call vote was approved. Later motion to reconsider was defeated.

NO. 65 MAXIMUM AWARDS - DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL

Intent: To reduce from 25 to 21 the maximum annual limit on initial financial aid awards and to eliminate the limitation on the total number of financial aid awards in Division I-A football.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.5.1, page 175, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"15.5.5.1 Division I-A Football. There shall be an annual limit of 25 21 on the number of initial counters (per 15.02.2.1) and an annual limit of 92 during the 1992-93 academic year, 88 during the 1993-94 academic year and 85 during the 1994-95 academic year and thereafter on the total number of counters (including initial counters) during each academic year in the sport of football at each Division I-A institution."

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; University of Florida; University of Kentucky; Louisiana State University; University of Mississippi; Mississippi State University, and Vanderbilt University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: This legislation provides an incentive for coaches to recruit only academically qualified student-athletes and to encourage maximum institutional efforts to retain those student-athletes. Current scholarship limitations make it possible to award 125 initial grants in the sport of football over a five-year period. However, at no time can the institution exceed 95 total grants (to be reduced to 85 by the 1994-95 academic year). This overall limit forces coaches to incorporate a significant attrition factor (be it natural, academic or forced) into their scholarship plans. Specifically, if 125 grants are awarded over a five-year period (25 initial awards per year), in order to remain under the overall scholarship limit, 30 (and, by 1994-95, 40) scholarship studentathletes must become noncounters or leave the program. Currently, if a student-athlete drops out of school or fails academically, the coach simply replaces that individual with a new scholarship the following year. Eliminating the overall scholarship limit and leaving limitations on initial awards only increases the importance of recruiting prospects who have a legitimate chance of succeeding and would place a greater emphasis on retaining enrolled student-athletes, thereby linking coaches' success on the field to the academic success of student-athletes in the classroom.

gislative Proposals	 A-93
gislatīve Proposals	 A-9

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 65-1 MAXIMUM AWARDS — DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL

Intent: To reinstate the maximum annual limit on the total number of counters (including initial counters) in the sport of football: while reducing the annual limit on the number of initial counters to 21.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 65, 15.5.5.1, as follows: [Division I-A football only]

"15.5.5.1 Division I-A Football. There shall be an annual limit of 21 on the number of initial counters (per 15.02.2.1) during: each academic year and an annual limit of 92 during the 1992-93 academic year, 88 during the 1993-94 academic year and 85 during the 1994-95 academic year and thereafter on the total number of counters (including initial, counters) during each academic year in the sport of football at each Division I-A institution."

Source: University of Arizona; Arizona State University; University; of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles, 1 University of Oregon; Oregon State University; Stanford University, and Washington State University.

Rationale. If Proposal No. 65 is adopted unamended, the total football grants (and total costs) will increase (21 x 5 = 105). With an eventual move to a cap of 85 total scholarships in football, it is, essential that the number of initial grants be reduced from 25 to 21, because the "run-off" problem otherwise could become seri-

Action: Moot due to withdrawal of No. 65.

MAXIMUM INITIAL GRANTS-IN-AID — PARTIAL QUALIFIERS AND NONQUALIFIERS

Intent: In Division I, to reduce gradually during the 1993-94, 1994-95 and 1995-96 academic years the number of grants-in-aid thatmay be awarded subsequent to the first academic year in residence to student-athletes who initially enroll at the certifying institution as partial qualifiers or nonqualifiers, so that no grants in-aid may be awarded to such students beginning with the. 1996-97 academic year.

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.5 by adding new 15.5.6, page 176, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote] "15.5.6 Partial Qualifiers and Nonqualifiers. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, each member institution shall limit the number of initial grants-in-aid awarded to studentathletes who initially enroll at the certifying institution. as partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers (per 14.02.9.2 and 14.02.9.3) as follows:

	1992 Convention Proceedings	
1-94		ı

"Academic	Football
Year	_
"1993-94	3
1994-95	2
1995-96	1
1996-97	0"

Bylaws: Amend 15.5 by adding new 15.5.6, page 176, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"15.5.6 Partial Qualifiers and Nonqualifiers. In Division I, each member institution shall limit the number of initial grants-in-aid awarded to student-athletes who initially enroll at the certifying institution as partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers (per 14.02.9.2 and 14.02.9.3) as follows:

and nonqual		ketball	Tr	ack	All Other	
"Academic Year	Men	Women	Men	Women	Sports*	
"1993- 94	2	2	2	2 1	*	
1994-95	1	1 1	i	ī	*	
1995-96 1996-97	Ô	ō	0	0	0	

*[a maximum of two awards in each sport over the threeyear period of 1993-961"

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Auburn University; University of Florida; University of Georgia; Louisiana State University; Mississippi State University; University of South Carolina, Columbia; University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and Vanderbilt University.

Effective Date August 1, 1993.

Rationale: This proposal will further strengthen academic standards by limiting the number of grants-in-aid that may be awarded to student-athletes who initially enroll at the certifying institution as partial qualifiers or nonqualifiers.

Action: Part A defeated by Division I-A; not moved by Division I-AA. Part B not moved.

NO. 67 FINANCIAL AID — SUMMER SCHOOL

Intent: To permit athletically related financial aid to be awarded to incoming freshman student-athletes to attend an institution's summer term, summer school or summer orientation period, provided the aid is granted in proportion to the amount of athletically related financial aid the students will receive during the succeeding academic year and the recipients become counters during the succeeding academic year.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.7.1.2, page 165, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote] "15.2.7.1.2 Summer Financial Aid — Incoming Student-Athletes. The following conditions apply to the awarding of financial aid

	A-9:
Legislative Proposals	

to a student-athlete to attend an institution in the summer prior to the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment:

[15.2.7.1.2-(a) through 15.2.7.1.2-(c) unchanged.]

- "(d) In Divisions I and II, the recipient shall receive athletically related financial aid only in proportion to the amount of athletically related aid that the student will receive during the succeeding academic year andshall become a counter during the succeeding aca-Aj demic year per Bylaw 15.5, and
- "(e) In Division III, 7the awarding institution certifies in writ ing that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability. The written certification shall be on file in the office of the director of athletics and shall be signed by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid."

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; Clemson University; University of Georgia; Georgia Institute of Technology; University of Oklahoma; Syracuse University; Unig versity of Tennessee, Knoxville, and Texas A&M University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The intent of this proposal is to provide an opportunity for, incoming student-athletes (prior to initial collegiate enrollment) to ,? receive athletically related financial aid to attend an institution's summer term. It should be permissible to utilize athletically related funds to support directly a student-athlete's attendance in summer school, inasmuch as it is academically sound to encourage incoming students to become familiar with academic demands . prior to the start of athletics competition in the fall.

Action: Defeated by Division I and by Division II (50-145, one abstention).

NO. 68 CANCELLATION OF FINANCIAL AID

Intent: To permit the immediate cancellation of institutional financial aid when a student-athlete voluntarily withdraws from a sport prior to the institution's first competition in that sport.

Bylaws: Amend 15.3.4.1, page 167, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.3.4.1 Gradation or Cancellation Permitted. Institutional financial aid may be gradated or canceled during the period of the award if the recipient:

[15.3.4.1-(a) through 15.3.4.1-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Voluntarily withdraws from a sport for personal reasons. Gradation or cancellation of aid in this instance may occur immediately if the recipient withdraws prior to the institution's first competition in that sport, but shall not occur prior to the conclusion of that semester or quarter if the recipient withdraws subsequent to the first competition."

1992 Convention Proceedings

[Remainder of 15.3.4.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Ama-

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: It is unfair to require member institutions to continue to provide financial aid to a student-athlete who withdraws from a sport prior to the member institution's first competition in that

Action: Adopted as amended by No. 68-1.

NO. 68-1 CANCELLATION OF FINANCIAL AID

'Intent: To specify that any aid that is gradated or canceled in a term during which the recipient withdraws from a sport prior to the institution's first competition in that sport, may not be awarded to another student-athlete during that term.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 68, 15.3.4.1, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.3.4.1 Gradation or Cancellation Permitted. Institutional financial aid may be gradated or canceled during the period of the award if the recipient:

[15.3.4.1-(a) through 15.3.4.1-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Voluntarily withdraws from a sport for personal reasons. Gradation or cancellation of aid in this instance may occur immediately if the recipient withdraws prior to the institution's first competition in that sport, but shall not occur prior to the conclusion of that semester or quarter if the recipient withdraws subsequent to the first competition. If the recipient withdraws prior to the institution's first competition in that sport, the recipient's financial aid may not be awarded to another student-athlete during the term in which the aid was gradated or canceled."

[Remainder of 15.3.4.1 unchanged.]

Source: University of California, Irvine; University of California, Santa Barbara; California State University, Fresno; California State University, Fullerton; California State University, Long Beach; New Mexico State University; University of Nevada, Las Vegas; University of the Pacific (California), and Utah State University.

Rationale: This amendment-to-amendment would place a safeguard in the rule to discourage coaches from "running off" student-athletes in order to award their financial aid to other recipients during that term.

Action: Adopted.

	A-97
egislative Proposals	

NO. 69 TUITION AWARDS — FORMER STUDENT-ATHLETES

Intent: To require member institutions to provide full-tuition awards to former student-athletes who have received full athletics grants-in-aid and who have exhausted athletics eligibility, and to specify that such grants be provided until the student-athletes have completed their degree requirements for graduation or are dismissed for academic or disciplinary reasons.

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.01.5.1 Exception — Tuition Awards to Former Student-Athletes. A former student-athlete may receive tuition awards pursuant to 16.3.1.2."

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.3.1 by adding new 15.3.1.5, page 166, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.3.1.5 Tuition Awards to Former Student-Athletes. A member institution may award tuition payments to former student-athletes pursuant to 16.3.1.2."

C. Bylaws: Amend 16.3.1 by adding new 16.3.1.2, page 185, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"16.3.1.2 Tuition Awards to Former Student-Athletes. A member institution shall provide to former student-athletes who have received full athletics grants-in-aid and who have exhausted all athletics eligibility annual financial aid awards that equal at least the value of a full tuition grant until the student-athletes complete all degree requirements for graduation or are dismissed from the institution for academic or disciplinary reasons."

 $\textbf{Source} \hbox{:}\ All\ nine\ members\ of\ the\ Metro\ Atlantic\ Athletic\ Conference}.$

Effective Date: July 1, 1992.

Rationale: Poor graduation rates of student-athletes can be partially attributed to aid "drop-offs" after playing eligibility expires. This legislation would partially resolve this inequity by mandating tuition aid availability for student-athletes who received full athletics grants while playing, but who have exhausted athletics eligibility.

Action: Parts A and B defeated; Part C moot.

NO. 70 HONORARY ACADEMIC AWARDS

Intent: To exclude honorary academic awards and research grants from the determination of the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid or cost of attendance for a student-athlete.

A.	Bylaws:	Amend	15.02.3.3,	page	160,	as	follows
----	---------	-------	------------	------	------	----	---------

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"15.02.3.3 Exempted Institutional Financial Aid. The following institutional financial aid is exempt and is not counted in determining a student-athlete's full grant-in-aid or in the institution's financial aid limitations:

"(a) An honorary award for outstanding academic achievement or an established institutional research grant that meets the criteria set forth in 15.02.5 (and must shall not be included in determining if the student-athlete's cost-of-attendance limitation has been met);"

[Remainder of 15.02.3.3 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.02.5, page 160, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"15.02.5 Honorary Academic Award/Research Grant. An honorary academic award for outstanding academic achievement or a research grant is an award that meets the following criteria: [15.02.5-(a) through 15.02.5-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) The award or grant is included in determining if the student-athlete's cost-of-attendance limitation has been met"

Source: All nine members of the Western Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Present NCAA legislation prevents student-athletes from fully realizing the benefits of outstanding academic achievement or research grants and athletics achievement. Recipients of honorary academic awards or research grants that exceed limitations on financial aid based upon athletics ability should not be required to forego the benefit of such academic achievement because of their ability to simultaneously hold an athletics grant-in-aid or otherwise meet the cost of education. NCAA legislation should not detract from institutional awards recognizing outstanding academic achievement when athletes are the recipients of such awards.

Action: Defeated by Division I (131-162) and Division III; adopted by Division II.

NO. 71 EQUIVALENCY COMPUTATIONS

Intent: To define "athletics financial aid" and to specify that equivalency computations for counters shall be based only upon "athletics financial aid."

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.02 by adding new 15.02.2, page 158, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15.02.2 Athletics Financial Aid. Athletics financial aid is aid awarded by an institution's department of athletics and is countable toward minimum financial aid requirements (per 20.9.1.2.1) and maximum equivalency limits (per 15.5.3)."

egislative Proposals	A-99
egisitative i ropostas	

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.3, pages 174-175, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

- "15.5.3.3 Equivalency Computations. In equivalency sports, each institutional financial aid award (per 15.02.3.1) to a counter shall be computed as follows:
- "(a) Once a student becomes a counter, the institution shalls count all institutional athletics financial aid (per 15.02.3.1 15.02.2) received for room, board, tuition and fees, as well as books (which shall count for calculation purposes as \$200 in the denominator and, if they are provided or their cost covered by the institution, as \$200 in the numerator, regardless of the actual amount received). Exempted government grants per 15.2.4 and exempted institutional aid per 15.02.3.3 specifically are excluded from this computation."

[Remainder of 15.5.3.3 unchanged.]

Source: All 10 members of the Big East Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: This proposal will simplify NCAA regulations by including in equivalency computations only financial aid that is based on athletics ability and exclude all other institutional financial aid.

Action: Defeated by Division I as amended by No. 71-1. Not moved in Division II.

NO. 71-1 EQUIVALENCY COMPUTATIONS

- Intent: To delete the proposed definition of "athletics financial aid" and to specify that the formula for equivalency computations shall be based on the countable financial aid formula used for minimum financial aid requirements for Division I membership.
- A. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 71-A, 15.02.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15 02 2 Athletics Financial Aid. Athletics financial aid is aid awarded by an institution's department of athletics and is countable toward minimum financial aid requirements (per 20.9.1 2.1) and maximum equivalency limits (per 15.5.3)"

B. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 71-B, 15.5.3.3, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

- "15.5.3.3 Equivalency Computations. In equivalency sports, each institutional financial aid award (per 15.02.3.1) to a counter shall be computed as follows:
- "(a) Once a student becomes a counter, the institution shall count all athletics countable financial aid (per 15 02 2 20.9.1.2.1) received for room, board, tuition and fees, as well as books, (which shall count for calculation purposes as \$200 in the denominator and, if they are provided or their cost covered by the institution, as \$200 in the numerator, regardless of the actual amount received). Exempted government grants per 15.2.4 and exempted institutional aid per 15.02.3.3 specifically are excluded from this computation."

A-100 _______1992 Convention Proceedings

[Remainder of 15.5.3.3, unchanged.]

Source: All 10 members of the Big East Conference.

Rationale: This amendment is intended to clear up any confusion caused by the wording of Proposal No. 71. The amendment will simplify NCAA regulations by using the same formula for maximum financial aid limitations and minimum financial aid requirements.

Action: Adopted by Division I (186-130) Not moved in Division II.

NO. 71-2 EQUIVALENCY COMPUTATIONS

Intent: To amend the definition of "athletics financial aid" to exclude it from applying to the minimum financial aid requirements for Division I membership.

Bylaws. Amend Proposal No. 71-A, 15.02.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15.02.2 Athletics Financial Aid. Athletics financial aid is aid awarded by an institution's department of athletics and is countable toward minimum financial aid requirements (per 20 9.1 2 1) and maximum equivalency limits (per 15.5.3)."

Source: All nine members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.

Rationale: Currently, Bylaw 20.9.1.2.1 uses a countable aid formula that includes all financial aid awarded by an institution. Adoption of Proposal No. 71 would result in conflicting definitions. This amendment would rectify this conflict, although the sponsors do not support the original proposal since it abrogates the cost-reduction measures adopted at the 1991 NCAA Convention.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 72 MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS — DIVISION I FINANCIAL AID

Intent: To permit a Division I member institution to count only unearned, nonrepayable financial aid awarded and administered by the member institution (including the athletics department) and based on athletics ability for purposes of meeting the minimum financial aid criteria.

Bylaws: Amend 20.9.1.2.1, page 351, as follows:

[Division I only]

"20.9.1.2.1 Countable Financial Aid Formula. Only countable unearned, nonrepayable financial aid administered by and awarded by the member institution (including the department of athletics) and based on athletics ability shall be used to meet the appropriate minimum."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

Effective Date: September 1, 1994.

_	A-101
egislative Proposals	

Rationale: This proposal is consistent with 1991 Convention Proposal No. 46-4, which was defeated. It would require that an institution use a more stringent definition of athletics aid in estab... lishing its financial aid commitment for purposes of Bylaww 20.9.1.2.1. Specifically, the amendment would make it clear that , for purposes of meeting the minimum financial aid criteria, aninstitution could count only unearned, nonrepayable financial aid awarded and administered by the member institution (in. cluding the athletics department) and based on athletics ability. Proposal No. 46 was amended at the 1991 Convention to permit any countable aid to be used in meeting the Division I financial aid criteria. The Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism feels strongly that this amendment is necessary to preserve the intended effect of Proposal No. 46.

Action: Defeated by Division I as amended by No. 72-1.

NO. 72-1 MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS — DIVISION I FINANCIAL AID

Intent: To specify that all institutional aid, within certain limits, is used as the basis for meeting NCAA Division I minimum financial aid requirements for membership.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 72, 20.9.1.2.1, as follows:

[Division I only]

"20.9.1.2.1 Countable Financial Aid Formula. Only unearned, nonrepayable financial aid administered by and awarded by the member institution (including the department of athletics) and based on athletics ability shall be used to meet the appropriate minimum."

Source: All nine members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.

Rationale: This amendment-to-amendment will ensure that Proposal No. 72 does not mandate that the minimum financial aid requirements for Division I membership under 20.9.1.2.1 be based solely on athletics aid awards and not, with certain exceptions, all institutional aid awarded to student-athletes.

Action: Adopted by Division I (168-148).

NO. 73 MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS — DIVISION I FINANCIAL AID

Intent: To revise the financial aid formula related to the computation of minimum awards for Division I membership requirements to indicate that only unearned, nonrepayable financial aid shall be counted to meet the minimum Division I financial aid requirements.

Bylaws: Amend 20.9.1.2.1, page 351, as follows:

[Division I only]

"20.9.1.2.1 Countable Financial Aid Formula. Only unearned, nonrepayable countable financial aid awarded by the member institution shall be used to meet the appropriate minimum."

______1992 Convention Proceedings A-102 ___

Source: All nine members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference. Effective Date: September 1, 1994.

Rationale: The Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference wishes to tighten the financial aid formula it proposed and that was adopted by the membership at the 1991 Convention while reminding the membership of the following:

- 1. If one accepts the concept that a financial aid commitment must be a requirement for Division I membership, the formula used should reflect an institution's entire commitment to a student-athlete.
- Institutional autonomy should be preserved in the distribution of financial aid to student-athletes, which is possible with this formula.
- Any further tightening of financial aid requirements will affect private schools adversely, since funding for financial aid must be largely self-generated. This proposal accounts for this injustice by allowing for a full reflection of institutional commitment to student-athletes.
- Under the current economic climate, it is a particularly inappropriate time to establish any financial aid formula more narrow than the one reflected in this proposal.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 74 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATIONS — MEN'S ICE HOCKEY

Intent: In Division I ice hockey, to specify that a recruited studentathlete who receives institutional financial aid granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability does not have to be included in the maximum institutional financial aid limitations until the student-athlete engages in varsity intercollegiate competition, provided the institution certifies the nonathletics basis of the student-athlete's admission and institutional financial aid; to specify that there shall be an annual limit of 20 on the value of financial aid awards (equivalencies) to counters during the 1992-93 academic year and an annual limit of 18 on the value of equivalences during the 1993-94 academic year and thereafter; to specify that there shall be an annual limit of 25 on the total number of counters, and to specify that a multiplesport participant who practices or competes in ice hockey and one or more other sports (other than football or basketball) shall be counted in men's ice hockey.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5, pages 170-178, as follows:

[Division I only]

"15.5 MAXIMUM INSTITUTIONAL GRANT-IN-AID LIMITA-TIONS BY SPORT

"15.5.1 Counters. A student-athlete shall be a counter and included in the maximum awards limitations set forth in this

	A-103
Legislauve Proposals	

bylaw under the following conditions.

[15.5.1.1 unchanged.]

"15.5.1.2 Recruited Student-Athlete

"15.5.1.2.1 Division I Football or, Basketball or Ice Hockey, Varsity Competition. In Division I football or, basketball or ice hockey, a student-athlete who was recruited by the awarding institution and who receives institutional financial aid (as set forth in 15.02.3.1) granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability does not have to be counted until the student-athlete engages in varsity intercollegiate competition (as opposed to freshman, B-team, subvarsity, intramural or club competition) in either of those sports. For this provision to be applicable, there shall be on file in the office of the athletics director certification by the faculty athletics representative, the admissions officer and the chair of the financial aid committee that the student's admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability. "15.5.1.2.2 Division I Football or, Basketball or Ice Hockey-Partial Qualifier. In Division I football or, basketball or ice hockey, a student-athlete who is a partial qualifier (as set forth in 14.02.9.2) and who was recruited by the awarding institution and who receives institutional financial aid that is not from athletics sources and that is based on financial need only (as set forth in 14.3.2.1.1) shall be a counter and included in the maximum awards limitations set forth in this bylaw when the student-athlete participates in an institutional practice session or represents the institution against outside competition.

"15.5.1.2.3 Sports Other Than Football and, Basketball and Ice Hockey. In all sports other than football and, basketball and ice hockey in Division I and in all sports in Division II, a student-athlete who was recruited by the awarding institution and who is receiving institutional financial aid (as set forth in 15.02.3.1) shall be a counter unless there is on file in the office of the athletics director certification by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability.

[Remainder of 15.5.1 and 15.5.2 unchanged.]

"15.5.3 Equivalency Sports

"15.5.3.1 Division I Maximum Equivalency Limits. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.3.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the following Division I sports:

"Men's Sports:

"Ice Hockey

A-104 ____

18 [effective 8/1/93]

[Remainder of 15.5.3, 15.5.4 and 15.5.5 unchanged.]

_____1992 Convention Proceedings 💢

"15.5.6 Ice Hockey Limitations

"15.5.6.1 Division I Ice Hockey. There shall be an annual limit of 20 during the 1992-93 academic year and 18 during the 1993-94 academic year and thereafter on the value of financial aid awards (equivalencies) to counters and an annual limit of 25 on the total number of counters in the sport of ice hockey at each Division I ice hockey institution.

"15 5 6 15.5.7 Multiple-Sport Participants

[15.5.6.1 and 15.5.6.2, renumbered as 15.5.7.1 and 15.5.7.2, unchanged.]

"15.5.7.3 Ice Hockey. A counter who practices or competes in men's ice hockey and one or more other sports (other than football or basketball) shall be counted in men's ice hockey."

[15.5.6.3 through 15.5.6.7, renumbered as 15.5.7.4 through 15.5.7.8, and 15.5.7 through 15.5.9, renumbered as 15.5.8 through 15.5.10, unchanged.]

Source: Boston College, Boston University, University of Maine, University of Massachusetts at Lowell, Merrimack College, University of New Hampshire, Northeastern University and Providence College.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: This proposal accomplishes three important goals. First, it recognizes the differences in the amount of nonathletically related financial aid available between private and public institutions that support intercollegiate ice hockey. If all recruited student-athletes receiving financial aid become counters once they engage in varsity competition, regardless of the source of whatever financial aid they are receiving, a greater degree of parity will exist in the game. Second, the adoption of this legislation will be meaningful, however, only if a limit is placed on the number of players on a team who can be receiving financial aid. This legislation limits the number of students engaging in competition in ice hockey to a fixed number and places ice hockey in the same category as football and basketball. Third, the proposal places ice hockey in the same category as football and basketball in the area of legislation governing multiple-sport participants. It recognizes that a student-athlete who is receiving financial aid and is playing ice hockey must have that financial aid counted in the sport of ice hockey, regardless of his involvement in a second sport and, thus, closes the multisport loophole.

Action: Defeated by Division I (70-71).

NO. 75 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Intent: To permit institutional personnel, with the student-athlete's consent, to assist a student-athlete in the management of Pell Grant funds.

egislatīve Proposals	 A-105
-Granding a registration	 -A-IU

Bylaws: Amend 16.12.1 by adding new 16.12.1.7, page 194, as follows:

[Division I only]

"16.12.1.7 Pell Grant Funds. A member institution, with the student-athlete's consent, may hold, manage and distribute in periodic payments to the student-athlete Pell Grant funds deposited by the student-athlete with the member institution."

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; Baylor University; University of Cincinnati; Clemson University; University of Georgia; Georgia Institute of Technology; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Oklahoma; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Texas Tech University; Syracuse University, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to create an exception to the extra-benefit rule analogous to the special academic services that currently are provided to student-athletes. It is permissive legislation designed to provide a financial-management service with the student-athlete's consent. This legislation would permit the student-athlete to deposit Pell Grant funds with the university, which, in turn, would establish a procedure whereby the student-athlete could withdraw funds for personal use in a timely fashion. There is minimal cost to the institution, but it does provide a worthwhile service to those student-athletes who wish to take advantage of it.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

Playing and Practice Seasons

NO. 76 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I BASKETBALL

Intent: To permit Division I member institutions to exempt annually a home exhibition contest against a foreign team and a home exhibition contest against a USA Basketball club team from its maximum number of basketball contests.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.2, pages 220-221, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests each year shall exclude the following:

[17.3.5.2-(a) through 17.3.5.2-(c) unchanged.]

- "(d) Foreign Team in U.S. For Division I only, a home exhibition contest against a foreign team in the U.S.;
- "(e) USA Basketball Club. For Division I only, a home exhibition contest against a 'club' member of USA Basketball, and"

A-106 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

[17.3.5.2-(d), relettered as 17.3.5.2-(f), unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.3.2, page 221, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.5.3.2 Additional Division I Options. Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests:

[17.3.5.3.2-(a) through 17.3.5.3.2-(c) unchanged.]

- "(d) Foreign Team in U.S. One contest against a foreign team in the United States,
- "(e) USA Basketball Club. The one basketball game against a 'club' member of USA Basketball, or"

[17.3.5.3.2-(f), relettered as 17.3.5.3.2-(d), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Subcommittee to Review 1991 Reform Proposals); all nine members of the Atlantic Coast Conference; all 10 members of the Atlantic 10 Conference; all 10 members of the Big East Conference; all eight members of the Big Eight Conference; all nine members of the Big Sky Conference; all 11 members of the Big Ten Conference; University of Arizona, Arizona State University, University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Florida; University of Kentucky; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; Stanford University; Vanderbilt University, and Washington State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: During the 1991 Convention, the Presidents Commission recommended that annual exemptions to the basketball schedule be changed to a once-in-four year exemption. In doing so, the games against a foreign team in the United States and a USA Basketball club team were swept up with the change. Neither of these games, however, requires travel or additional costs or results in lost class time. The games normally are played after the beginning of practice and prior to the start of the regular season. They usually are considered "exhibition" or "practice" games. Neither counts in NCAA statistics or the institution's official won-lost record. Both games produce much-needed revenue. The game against the foreign team also can result in a positive cultural experience. For these reasons, it is recommended that a home exhibition contest against a foreign team and a home exhibition contest against a USA Basketball club member be reinstated as annual exemptions.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 77 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I BASKETBALL

Intent: To permit a Division I member institution to exempt annually a home exhibition contest against a foreign team or a home exhibition contest against a USA Basketball club team or an informal scrimmage against outside competition.

islative Proposals	A-107
rsiauve e roposais	 A-10/

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.2, pages 220-224, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests each year shall exclude the following:

[17.3.5.2-(a) through 17.3.5.2-(c) unchanged.]

- "(d) In Division I only, one of the following:
 - "(1) A home exhibition contest against a foreign team;
 - "(2) A home exhibition contest against a 'club' member of USA Basketball, or
 - "(3) An informal scrimmage with outside competition (conducted in privacy without publicity or official scoring)."

[17.3.5.2-(d), relettered as 17.3.5.2-(e), unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.3.2, page 221, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.5.3.2 Additional Division I Options. Not more than once 17.3. every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the. maximum number of basketball contests:

[17 3.5.3.2-(a) through 17.3.5.3.2-(c) unchanged.]

- "(d) Foreign Team in U.S. One contest against a foreign team in the United States;
- "(e) USA Basketball Club. The one basketball game against a 'club' member of USA Basketball, or"

[17.3.5.2-(f), relettered as 17.3.5.3.2-(d), unchanged.]

Source: All nine members of the Northeast Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The purpose of this legislation is to provide Division I member institutions the option to exempt annually a home exhibition contest against a foreign team, a home exhibition contest against a USA Basketball club team or an informal scrimmage against outside competition Home exhibition contests against a foreign team or a USA Basketball club team can be revenue generating, will not result in missed class time and can provide cultural benefits to student-athletes. Those institutions that do not have such an opportunity should have the option of exempting an informal scrimmage with outside competition, provided the scrimmage is private, not publicized and no official scoring is kept.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 78 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I BASKETBALL

Intent: To permit a Division I member institution to exempt annually a home exhibition contest against a foreign team or a home

______1992 Convention Proceedings

exhibition contest against a USA Basketball club team from its maximum number of basketball contests.

Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.2, pages 220-221, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests each year shall exclude the following:

[17.3.5.2-(a) through 17.3.5.2-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) A home exhibition contest against a foreign team or a home exhibition contest against a 'club' member of USA Basketball, and"

[17.3.5.2-(d), relettered as 17.3.5.2-(e), unchanged.]

Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.3.2, page 221, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.5.3.2 Additional Division I Options. Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests:

[17.3.5.3.2-(a) through 17.3.5.3.2-(c) unchanged.]

- "(d) Foreign Team in U.S. One contest against a foreign team in the United States;
- "(e) USA Basketball Club. The one basketball game against a 'club' member of USA Basketball, or"

[17.3.5.3.2-(f), relettered as 17.3.5.3.2-(d), unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Auburn University; University of Florida; University of Georgia; Louisiana State University; University of Mississippi; University of South Carolina, Columbia; University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and Vanderbilt University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: During the 1991 Convention, the Presidents Commission recommended that annual exemptions to the basketball schedule be changed to a once-in-four year exemption. In doing so, the games against a foreign team in the United States and a USA Basketball club team were swept up with the change. Neither of these games, however, requires travel or additional costs or results in lost class time. The games normally are played after the beginning of practice and prior to the start of the regular season. They usually are considered "exhibition" or "practice" games. Neither counts in NCAA statistics or the institution's official won-lost record. Both games produce much-needed revenue. The game against the foreign team also can result in a positive cultural experience. For these reasons, it is recommended that Division I institutions be permitted to exempt annually either a home exhibition contest against a foreign team or a home contest against a USA Basketball club member.

Action:	Moot	due	to	adoption	of	No.	76

egislative Proposals	A	-10

NO. 79 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I RASKETBALL

Intent: To permit Division I member institutions to exempt annually. one game against a foreign team in the United States from its or maximum number of basketball contests.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.2, pages 220-221, as follows:

[Division I only]

ball contests each year shall exclude the following:

[17.3.5.2-(a) through 17.3.5.2-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Foreign Team in U.S. For Division I only, one homes contest against a foreign team in the United States No class time may be missed for this contest, and"

[17.3.5.2-(d), relettered as 17.3.5.2-(e), unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.3.2, page 221, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.5.3.2 Additional Division I Options. Not more than once. every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt 4 not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests:

[17.3.5.3.2-(a) through 17.3.5.3.2-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Foreign Team in U.S. One contest against a foreign team in the United States," [17.3.5.3.2-(e) and 17.3.5.3.2-(f), relettered as 17.3.5.3.2-(d) and 17.3.5.3.2-(e), unchanged.

Source: All 10 members of the Big East Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The contest against a foreign team is a home game and does not result in missed class time or expenses as do some of the other "one-in-four-year" exemptions. In addition, the contest serves as a tremendous cultural experience and public relations, vehicle. Thus, the contest should be removed from the "one-infour-year" cycle and permitted as an annual exemption from a Division I institution's maximum number of basketball contests.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No. 76.

NO. 80 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I BASKETBALL

Intent: To add an informal practice scrimmage with outside competition to the list of "one-in-four-year" contest exemptions in Division I basketball.

Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.3.2, page 221, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.5.3.2 Additional Division I Options. Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the

______1992 Convention Proceedings A-110 _

maximum number of basketball contests:

[17 3.5.3.2-(a) through 17.3.5.3.2-(f) unchanged.]

"(g) Informal Practice Scrimmage. One informal practice scrimmage with outside competition, provided it is conducted in privacy without publicity or official scoring."

Source: All nine members of the Northeast Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

"17.3.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basket Rationale: The purpose of this legislation is to add an inexpensive option to the list of exemptions to countable contests in basketball that may be used once every four years. The list of options currently set up to go into effect in August 1992 includes either options that are invitational in nature or potentially cost prohibitive for some member institutions. This proposal would ensure that all Division I institutions have the opportunity to use the exemption in a cost-efficient manner.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 81 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I BASKETBALL

Intent. To permit Division I member institutions to participate in the Great Alaska Shootout men's basketball tournament prior to December 1 (i.e., Thanksgiving weekend).

**Bylaws: Amend 17.3.3.1, pages 216-217, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.3.1 Exceptions. The following basketball contests (games or scrimmages) are permitted prior to the first contest dates specified under 17.3.3:

[17.3.3.1-(a) and 17.3.3.1-(b) unchanged.]

- "(c) USA Basketball, Tip-Off Classic, Foreign-Team Games, Great Alaska Shootout. The following basketball games may be played after November 15 by a Division I institution and after November 1 by a Division II or III institution:
 - "(1) One game against a 'club' member of USA Basketball;
 - "(2) One game against a foreign team in the United States;
 - "(3) The Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game, or;
 - "(4) For Division II members only, one game against a foreign team in Canada., or
 - "(5) For Division I members only, all games in the Great Alaska Shootout men's basketball tournament sponsored by an active member located in Alaska."

[Remainder of 17.3.3.1 unchanged.]

Source: University of Cincinnati University of Nevada; North	; The Citadel; Fordham University least Louisiana University; Oregon s College (California); Santa Clar tate College, and University of Wis

gislative Proposals	4	A-1	ì
Statute 1 reposition ————————————————————————————————————			

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The Great Alaska Shootout has become an Alaskan tradition, and it continues to contribute to the visibility of NCAA athletics in the state of Alaska. Current legislation allows this tournament to be held over the Thanksgiving holiday. Conducting the shootout over this holiday also minimizes missed class time on campus and enables student-athletes to visit America's northernament state with its unique natural environment and diverse cultures. Continuation of this tournament over the Thanksgiving holiday weekend is in the best interests of NCAA institutions, their student-athletes and the people of Anchorage and Alaska.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 82 RESOLUTION: DIVISION I BASKETBALL PLAYING SEASON

[Division I only]

"Whereas, the membership of Division I has adopted the date of in December 1 for the first contest in the sport of basketball, commencing with the 1992-93 academic year; and

"Whereas, this later first contest date has shortened each institution's playing season in the sport of basketball; and

"Whereas, the shortened playing season will require many member institutions to play contests during fall term final examination periods;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council Subcommittee to Review 1991 Reform Proposals and the NCAA Council consider sponsoring legislation at the 1993 NCAA Convention that would permit Division I institutions to play basketball games the weekend of Thanksgiving in lieu of during their final examination periods."

Source: University of California, Irvine; University of California, Santa Barbara; California State University, Fresno; University of Hawaii; California State University, Fullerton; University of Nevada, Las Vegas; New Mexico State University; University of the Pacific (California), and Utah State University.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 83 SPRING FOOTBALL PRACTICE — DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA

Intent: To permit 15 days of spring football practice within 29 consecutive days and to permit contact to occur throughout the entire spring football-practice period.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.6, page 242, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote] "17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football is prohibited, except for the following:

"(a) Spring Practice — Division I. In Division I, 15 postseason practice sessions are permissible, provided they are conduct-

A-112 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

ed within a period of 22 29 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar, with no practices permitted on Sundays. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 10 of the 15 sessions may involve contact. The amount of time that a student-athlete may be involved in such postseason practice activities shall be limited to a maximum of 20 hours per week;"

[Remainder of 17.7.6 unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; Baylor University; Clemson University; Colorado State University; East Carolina University; Kansas State University; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Oklahoma; Syracuse University; University of Texas at Austin; Texas A&M University; Texas Christian University, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Spring football practice is the most important time to teach technique, experiment with position changes, evaluate personnel and install new offensive and defensive systems. By allowing the use of 29 days, the institution's coaching staff can maximize the effectiveness of spring practice. Restricting practice time to 22 days eliminates the flexibility to make adjustments arising from weather, class schedules or other problems. In addition, because practice is limited to 15 days in which to teach and learn correct blocking and tackling techniques, the use of contact should be left to the discretion of the institution's coaching staff to allow for the development of the team.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I-A and I-AA, as amended by No. 83-1.

NO. 83-1 SPRING FOOTBALL PRACTICE — DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA

Intent: To specify that only 10 of the 15 permissible spring football practice sessions may involve contact.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 83, 17.7.6, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]
"17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football
is prohibited, except for the following:

"(a) Spring Practice — Division I. In Division I, 15 postseason practice sessions are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 29 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar, with no practices permitted on Sundays. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 10 of the 15 sessions may involve contact. The amount of time that a

	Α-	1!	13
ogislative Proposals	 		

student-athlete may be involved in such postseason practice. activities shall be limited to a maximum of 20 hours per week."

[Remainder of 17.7.6 unchanged.]

- Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; University of Colorado, Boulder; East Carolina University; Louisiana State University; University of Miami (Florida); University of Oklahoma, and Texas Tech University.
- Rationale: Retaining the 10 contact sessions preserves the spirit of reform, enhances the use of weekends for practice activities, allows scheduling flexibility that may be necessary because of inclement weather and reduces the concentration of practice activities to help student-athletes.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I-A and I-AA.

SPRING FOOTBALL PRACTICE -- DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA

Intent: To omit Sundays from counting toward the consecutive 22 calendar-day period during which spring football practice must occur in Division I.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.6, page 242, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote] "17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football is prohibited, except for the following:

"(a) Spring Practice - Division I. In Division I, 15 postseason practice sessions are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 22 consecutive calendar days, omitting Sundays and vacation and examinations days officially announced on the institution's calendar, with no practices permitted on Sundays. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 10 of the 15 sessions may involve contact. The amount of time that a student-athlete may be involved in such postseason practice activities shall be limited to a maximum of 20 hours per week:"

[Remainder of 17.7.6 unchanged.]

Source: All nine members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Requiring 15 postseason practice sessions within a consecutive 22-day period often requires a team to practice six days in a row. Compressing these sessions into such a short time period may not allow for adequate recovery time and may potentially increase the chance of injury to student-athletes. Omitting Sundays from the consecutive 22-day period would, at the most, add four days to the period of time already allocated for spring

_______1992 Convention Proceedings

practice and would permit greater flexibility in arranging practice schedules.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 85 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: To exempt a conference championship in Division I-AA football from the maximum football contest limitations.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.5.2, pages 240-241, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"17.7.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of football contests shall exclude the following:

[17 7.5.2-(a) through 17,7.5.2-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Divisions I-AA and III Conference Tournament. In Divisions I-AA and III, a conference-sponsored postseason tournament (i.e., one between teams that are not identified until the end of the preceding regular season), not to exceed one contest for any one member institution;"

[17.7.5.2-(f) through 17 7.5.2-(i) unchanged.]

Source: Boston University; University of Connecticut; Fordham University; College of the Holy Cross; Lafayette College; University of Maine; University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Northeastern University, and College of William and Mary.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: Institutions that conduct Division I-AA football programs desire the opportunity to participate in a postseason conference championship (not to exceed one contest) without including the contest in the maximum number of football contests. In most instances, such a contest will be the only postseason opportunity for the institution's football team.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 86 HERITAGE BOWL

Intent: To specify that the Heritage Bowl shall be conducted no earlier than one week after the conclusion of the National Collegiate Division I-AA Football Championship.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.4, page 240, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"17.7.4 End of Playing Season. A member institution's last contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football shall not be played outside the traditional segment (Division III) or after the second Saturday or Sunday in December (Divisions I and II), except for the following:

[17.7.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Bowl Games, NCAA and NAIA Championships, Internation-

	 A-115
Legislative Proposals	

al Competition and Heritage Bowl. One postseason game approved by the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee or those games played in the National Collegiate Division I-AA, Division II and Division III. Football Championships; football contests played on a foreign tour certified by the member institution, or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics football championships. In Division I-AA only, a member institution's last contest also may include participation in the Heritage Bowl to be held between the conference champions of the MidEastern Athletic Conference and the Southwestern Athletic Conference no earlier than one week after the conclusion of the National Collegiate Division I-AA Football Championship."

[Remainder of 17.7.4 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will ensure that the Heritage Bowl in no way conflicts with the Division I-AA Football Championship and is consistent with the intent of the Division I-AA membership when it voted to establish the Heritage Bowl.

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA, as amended by No. 86-1.

NO. 86-1 HERITAGE BOWL

Intent: To specify that the Heritage Bowl shall be conducted not earlier than the Monday after the conclusion of the National Collegiate Division I-AA Football Championship.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 86, 17.7.4, as follows: [Division I-AA football only]

"17.7.4 End of Playing Season. A member institution's last contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football shall not be played outside the traditional segment (Division III) or after the second Saturday or Sunday in December (Divisions I and II), except for the following:

[17.7.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Bowl Games, NCAA and NAIA Championships, International Competition and Heritage Bowl. One postseason game approved by the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee or those games played in the National Collegiate Division I-AA, Division II and Division III Football Championships; football contests played on a foreign tour certified by the member institution, or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics football championships. In Division I-AA only, a member institution's last contest also may include participation in the Heritage Bowl to be held between the conference champions of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and the Southwestern Athletic Conference no earlier than one week the Monday after the

conclusion of the National Collegiate Division I-AA Football Championship."

[Remainder of 17.7.4 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA.

NO. 87 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL GAMES

Intent: To specify that all postseason championship football games and "bowl games" (e.g., the Heritage Bowl) that are exempt from the maximum number of football contests in Divisions I-A and I-AA, except for the Division I-AA Football Championship, shall meet the reporting requirements applicable to the certification of postseason bowl games.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.7.5.2, pages 240-242, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote] "17.7.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of football contests shall exclude the following:

[17.7.5.2-(a) and 17.7.5.2-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Heritage Bowl. Participation in the Heritage Bowl held between the conference champions of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and the Southwestern Athletic Conference, which shall meet the reporting requirements set forth in 30.8 in order to be exempt;"

[Remainder of 17.7.5.2 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 18.7.2, page 330, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"18.7.2 Postseason Football Championship and Postseason
Bowl Certification. In Division I-A, postseason Bowl games
must meet the conditions and requirements set forth in 30.8 in
order to be certified. In Division I-AA, postseason championship football games and bowl games that are exempt
from the maximum number of football contests per
17.7.5.2, except for the Division I-AA Football Championship, must meet the reporting requirements set forth
in 30.8."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will ensure that postseason championship football games and "bowl games" in Division I-AA (except for the Division I-AA Football Championship) that are exempt from the maximum number of football contests, such as the Heritage Bowl, will be administered and conducted in a safe and responsible manner consistent with the current requirements applicable to the certification of postseason bowl games in Division I-A.

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA.

Legislative Proposals A-1	_ A-11		ive Proposals	I poiste
---------------------------	--------	--	---------------	----------

NO. 88 DIVISIONS I AND II PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — INDIVIDUAL SPORTS

- Intent: In Divisions I and II, to permit member institutions' coaches in individual sports to participate in individual workout sessions with student-athletes from the coaches' team during the summer only, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. [Note: Section B of this proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]
- A. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1.2 by adding new 17.02.1.2.2, renumbering subsequent sections, page 198, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.02.1.2.2 Divisions I and II — Summer Workout Sessions in Individual Sports. In individual sports only, a coach may participate in individual workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach's team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, by amending the respective section entitled "Summer Practice," as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.__5.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Council. In individual sports only, a coach may participate in individual workout sessions with a student-athlete from the coach's team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete."

Source: NCAA Council (Subcommittee to Review 1991 Reform Proposals).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: At the 1991 Convention, legislation was adopted to restrict practice activities during the summer in individual sports. Under the definition of practice, a student-athlete would be precluded from seeking individual assistance from the student-athlete's coach even on an informal basis. For example, a student-athlete could not play a round of golf or a tennis match with his or her coach. This proposal would permit individual interaction between a coach and a student-athlete at the student-athlete's request during the summer (as opposed to the academic year) without compromising the principle underlying the prohibition against out-of-season practice.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

A-118 _______1992 Convention Proceedings

NO. 89 DIVISIONS I AND II PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES

[Note: Upon the recommendation of the parliamentarian, the chair intends to rule Proposal No. 89 out of order. The sponsors have asked that the proposal be circulated in order to challenge the chair's ruling.]

Intent: To permit a coach in the sport of crew to be present during an individual's voluntary workout to provide safety or skill instruction without counting such activity as a countable athletically related activity.

Bylaws Amend 17.02.1.2.1, page 198, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.02.1.2.1 Divisions I and II Safety Exception A coach may be present during voluntary individual workouts in the institution's regular practice facility (without the workouts being considered as countable athletically related activities) in the following situations, and the coach may spot or provide safety or skill instruction but cannot conduct the individual's workouts:

"(a) Crew — When the student-athlete is engaged in crew."

[17.02.1.2.1-(a) through 17.02.1.2.1-(g), relettered as 17.02.1.2.1-(b) through 17.02.1.2.1-(h), unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the West Coast Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Crew is a high-risk activity, as is any water sport. Due to the potential for life-threatening accidents, the sport of crew is best served by allowing the coach to supervise any in-water activities without considering such an activity as a countable athletically related activity. Such an exception is consistent with the exception currently provided for the sports of swimming and diving and water polo.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 90 TEAM SPORTS — CREW

[Note: Upon the recommendation of the parliamentarian, the chair intends to rule Proposal No. 90 out of order. The sponsors have asked that the proposal be circulated in order to challenge the chair's ruling.]

Intent: To include crew as a team sport governed by NCAA playing season rules.

Bylaws: Amend 17.02.15.1, page 202, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]
"17.02.15.1 Team Sports. The following are classified as team sports for purposes of this bylaw:

	Δ -	-11
ecislative Proposals		11.

"Baseball Lacrosse
Basketball Soccer
Crew Softball
Field Hockey Volleyball
Football Water Polo"

Source: All eight members of the West Coast Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The intent of 1991 Convention reform legislation related to playing and practice seasons was to reduce time demands placed on student-athletes. Similar regulations should apply uniformly to all varsity programs. Thus, in the sport of crew, even though there is no NCAA-sponsored championship, limitations governing playing and practice seasons (e.g., daily/weekly time limits) should apply to all institutions that conduct a varsity program (and not only to those institutions that utilize crew for purposes of meeting membership requirements).

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 91 MAXIMUM DATES OF COMPETITION — FENCING

Intent: To permit limited additional individual, nonteam scoring opportunities in the sport of fencing.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.4, page 230, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.5.4.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. In all divisions, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of fencing during the permissible fencing playing season to 11 dates of competition (including not more than four individual tournaments that are counted as single dates of competition), except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.5.4.2.

"17.5.4.1.1 Individual Tournament Limitations — Institutional. An individual tournament that does not include any team scoring or the recognition of a team champion shall count as a single date of competition (not to exceed four tournaments) for those institutions that do not have more than four individuals competing therein, regardless of the number of days during which tournament competition takes place.

[17.5.4.1.1, renumbered as 17.5.4.1.2, unchanged.]

"17 5.4 1.2 17.5.4.1.3 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 11 dates of competition in fencing (including not more than four individual tournaments that are counted as single dates of competition). This limitation includes those dates of competition in

which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution.

"17.5.4.1.3.1 Individual Tournament Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual tournament that does not include any team scoring or the recognition of a team champion shall count as a single date of competition (in not more than four tournaments) for the participating individuals, regardless of the number of days during which tournament competition takes place."

Source: All eight members of the Ivy Group.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal recognizes the desirability of individual, nonteam scoring competition in the sport of fencing. This counting method currently is allowed in the sport of tennis.

Action: Defeated by Division I and adopted by Division III. Not moved by Division II.

NO. 92 MAXIMUM CONTEST LIMITATIONS — FIELD HOCKEY

Intent: To permit member institutions in all divisions in the sport of field hockey to engage in 20 contests during the traditional segment and five dates of competition during the nontraditional segment instead of an overall limitation of 20 dates of competition in Division I, 19 dates of competition in Division II and 17 dates of competition in Division III.

Bylaws: Amend 17.6.4, page 234, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.6.4 Number of Contests and Dates of Competition

"17.6.4.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of field hockey during the institution's field hockey playing season in any one year to the following number of dates of competition including games and scrimmages 20 contests during the traditional segment and five dates of competition during the nontraditional segment, except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.6.4.2.

- "(a) Division I 20
- "(b) Division II 19
- "(c) Division III -- 17

"17.6.4.1.1 In-Season Foreign Competition. A member institution may play one or more of its countable field hockey **contests or** dates of competition in one or more foreign countries on one trip during the prescribed playing season. However, except for contests played in

roceedings	3.3

Canada and Mexico or on a certified foreign tour (see 17.23), the institution may not engage in such in-season. foreign competition more than once every four years. "17.6.4.1.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each

academic year in the following number of dates of competition in field hockey not more than 20 field hockey contests during the traditional segment and five dates of competition in field hockey during the nontraditional. segment (this limitation includes those contests or dates of competition in which the student represents; the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or, freshman team of the institutions)."

[Remainder of 17.6.4 unchanged.]

Source: Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, Boston University, Hartwick College, Ithaca College, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania, Northeastern University, University of Southern Maine and College of Wooster.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: In past years, there has been no proposed legislation to equalize the fall sports of field hockey and soccer. Since the sports' championships take place at approximately the same time and since the sports place similar demands on the individual participants, the opportunities and constraints should be equalized. This request seems to be very timely, given the fact that college athletes seem more interested in specialization rather than multisport participation. This also provides field hockey with the opportunity to strengthen program commitments and provide the maximum opportunity for continuation of the sport at the highest level of representation and success.

Action: Adopted by all three divisions.

NO. 93 FIRST CONTEST DATE — DIVISIONS I AND II SOCCER

Intent: To permit Divisions I and II member institutions to begin competition in the sport of soccer during the traditional segment on September 1 (or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday).

Bylaws: Amend 17.14.2.2.1, page 273, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.14 2.2.1 Traditional Segment

"(a) Divisions I and II - September 71 (or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday)."

[Remainder of 17.14 2.2.1 unchanged.]

Source: Adelphi University; Campbell University; University of Evansville; Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck; Quincy

______1992 Convention Proceedings

College; St. Louis University; St. Mary's College (California), and Seton Hall University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: This proposal accomplishes three important goals. First, it recognizes that men's and women's soccer are traditional fall sports that begin NCAA postseason play in November and should be aligned with other traditional fall sports (e.g., football and women's volleyball). Second, it will allow for an additional weekend of competition, which will benefit the student-athlete by reducing missed class time (i.e., midweek contests) at no additional cost to competing institutions. Finally, and most importantly, this proposal would address the concern for the safety and well-being of the student-athlete by reducing the risk of injury that a compressed schedule places on the individual.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II, as amended by No. 93-1.

NO. 93-1 FIRST CONTEST DATE — DIVISIONS I AND II SOCCER

Intent: To establish the first Saturday in September as the first permissible contest date in Divisions I and II soccer.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 93, 17.14.2.2.1, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.14.2.2.1 Traditional Segment

"(a) Divisions I and II — September 1 (or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday) The first Saturday in Septemher."

[Remainder of 17.14.2.2.1 unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the Patriot League.

Rationale: This amendment permits an institution to use the first weekend in September as a competitive weekend. The opening date of the season would change with the calendar but would never be earlier than September 1 or later than September 7.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 94 PRESEASON SOCCER SCRIMMAGES

Intent: To permit member institutions an opportunity to participate in three soccer scrimmages during the preseason practice period prior to the first scheduled contest.

Bylaws: Amend 17.14.4.1.1, page 274, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.14.4.1.1 Scrimmages/Exhibition Games, A member institution may play up to three soccer scrimmages or exhibition games (which shall not count toward the institution's won-lost record) prior to the first scheduled contest during a particular academic year, provided such scrimmages or exhibition games are conducted during the institution's declared playing

Legislative Proposals	A	1	2	
ZZ COROTTO CONT				

season per 17.14.1, provided such scrimmages or exhibition games are not conducted prior to the first permissible contest date per 17.14.2 and are counted against the maximum number of contests."

Source: Adelphi University; Campbell University; University of Evansville; Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck; Quincy College; St. Louis University; St. Mary's College (California), and Seton Hall University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: This proposal would allow for the opportunity to scrimmage in the sport of soccer in order to adequately prepare student-athletes during the permissible preseason practice period prior to the first scheduled contest (i.e., 21 "practice opportunities"). It also would not increase time demands on the student-athlete or increase the number of allowable contests, thereby creating no additional cost.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and III, defeated by Division II.

NO. 95 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — DIVIDING SEGMENTS

Intent: To specify that a Division III member institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall must complete all practice and competition by October 30, and to specify that an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the spring may not begin practice or competition until February 1.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.10.2, page 206, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.1.10.2 Dividing Traditional and Nontraditional Segments. A member institution that divides its **practice and** playing season into two distinct segments per 17.1.2 and conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall must complete all **practice and** competition by January 1 October 30 of the academic year involved; conversely, a member institution that conducts its traditional segment in the fall may not participate in a contest begin practice or competition during its nontraditional segment until after January 1 February 1 of the academic year involved. These restrictions do not preclude the completion of permissible practice activities in either segment after January 1"

Source: All eight members of the Empire Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The current rules allow sports subject to segment limitations to utilize much of the academic year to conduct their practice and playing seasons. This amendment places a restriction on the times when traditional and nontraditional activities may occur, thereby reducing demands on athletics program resources and on the student-athletes themselves.

Action: Adopted by Division III (145-90).

A-124 1992 Convention Proceeding	A-124	1992 Convention Proceedings
----------------------------------	-------	-----------------------------

NO. 96 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES

Intent: To eliminate "captain's practices" as countable athletically related activities in Division III.

. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1.1, pages 197-198, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.02.1.1 Countable Athletically Related Activities. The following are considered countable athletically related activities:

[17 02.1.1-(a) through 17.02.1.1-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) On-court or on-field activities called by any member or members of a team and confined primarily to members of that team that are considered as requisite for participation in that sport (e.g., captain's practices)."

Source: All 26 members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The prohibition against captain's practices or other activities called by members of an institution's team outside the playing season could lead to many violations. It is natural for student-athletes outside the playing season to contact each other to participate in activities related to their sport. The determination of whether such activities are prerequisites for being a member of the team is too subjective and, thus, not enforceable.

Action: Defeated by Division III.

NO. 97 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES

Intent: To permit a coach in Division III to be present at voluntary individual workouts in the institution's facility in the sport of track and field (field events) without such workouts being considered as countable athletically related activities.

Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1.2.2, pages 198-199, as follows: [Division III only]

"17.02.1.2.2 Division III Gymnastics and, Swimming and Diving, and Track and Field Safety Exception. A coach may be present during voluntary individual workouts in gymnastics that involve the use of gymnastics equipment in the institution's gymnastics facilities or, in swimming and diving when the studentathlete uses the institution's swimming or diving facilities, or in track and field when the student-athlete is engaged in field events without the workouts being considered countable. The coach may spot or provide safety or skill instruction during these workouts."

Source: All 26 members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.	. 136
Legislative Proposals	A-125

Rationale: A safety exception already exists in the National Collegiate Championship sports of fencing, gymnastics, rifle, skiing and water polo, as well as in the Division III sport of swimming, and diving. It makes sense to establish a safety exception in Division III track and field like the exception that currently exists in Divisions I and II, since it can be argued that this sport is just as dangerous in Division III. In fact, it can be argued that because Division III student-athletes tend to be less skilled than their higher division counterparts, the risks at Division III institutions are greater.

Action: Defeated by Division III. Later motion to reconsider also defeated.

NO. 98 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT

Intent: To limit Division III nontraditional segments to 26 days and to prohibit countable athletically related activities during at least one day per week during that segment.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.2, page 202, as follows: [Division III only]

"17.1.2 Segments of Playing Season. For all team sports and for all individual sports that do not utilize the 144-day traditional season option, each member institution may divide the playing season into not more than two distinct segments, as follows:

[17.1.2-(a) unchanged.]

- "(b) Nontraditional Segment. The remaining portion of the playing season shall be known as the 'nontraditional segment.'
 In Division III, sports conducting nontraditional segments shall be limited to 26 dates on which practice and competition may occur."
- **B. Bylaws**: Amend 17.1.6.1, page 204, as follows: [Division III only]

"17.1.6.1 Football and Basketball and Both Traditional and Nontraditional Segments in All Other Sports. All countable athletically related activities shall be prohibited during one calendar day per week in the sports of football and basketball and during both the traditional and nontraditional segments in all other sports."

Source: All 26 members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: Placing limitations on nontraditional segments appears to be both a desirable objective and consistent with the principle of reducing time demands on student-athletes. Establishing a limit in sports that conduct nontraditional seasons of 26 dates in which to practice or compete and mandating one day off per week when there can be no countable athletically related activi-

ties would achieve such an objective. Institutions, however, should have flexibility in determining the days during the non-traditional season on which practice or competition will occur.

Action: Defeated by Division III (122-125).

NO. 99 DIVISION III PRESEASON PRACTICE OPPORTUNITIES — TRADITIONAL SEGMENT

Intent: In Division III, to maintain 27 preseason practice opportunities in football, to establish 20 preseason practice opportunities in all sports other than football in which the NCAA championship occurs in the fall, and to establish October 15 as the beginning of preseason practice in those sports in which the NCAA championship occurs in the winter and the third week in January as the beginning of preseason practice in those sports in which the NCAA championship occurs in the spring. [Note: The following proposal is presented in a nontraditional format]

Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, pages 209-320, for each sport by amending the respective section entitled "Preseason Practice — Traditional Segment," as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.__ Preseason Practice
"17.__ Traditional Segment

"(a) Fall Sports Except Football — 20 practice opportunities for all sports.

"(b) Winter Sports — October 15.

"(c) Spring Sports — Third week in January."

Source: All eight members of the Empire Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The sponsors believe that the proposed amendment represents a "middle ground" to the more restrictive legislation introduced at the 1991 NCAA Convention. These starting dates limit the extent of the playing and practice seasons while maintaining the integrity and viability of many programs.

Action: Defeated by Division III.

NO. 100 DIVISION III PRESEASON PRACTICE OPPORTUNITIES — TRADITIONAL SEGMENT

Intent: To permit Division III member institutions 21 preseason practice opportunities prior to an institution's first contest or date of competition in the traditional segment in all sports other than football. [Note: The following proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, pages 209-320, for each sport except football by amending the respective sections entitled "Preseason Practice."

[Division III only]

Legislative Proposals A-	I.	2	
--------------------------	----	---	--

- "17.___2.1.1 Traditional Segment
- "(b) Division III August 24 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's tall term, whichever date occurs first The date that permits a maximum of 21 practice opportunities (see 17.02.13) prior to the first scheduled intercollegiate contest or date of competition in the traditional segment, regardless of when the traditional segment occurs."

Source: All 26 members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: It makes more sense to utilize preseason opportunities during the traditional playing season rather than using specified starting dates. It will provide all sports an equal opportunity to prepare for the traditional season and enable Division III institutions to maintain a consistent preseason practice period, rather than facing problems created by varying academic calendars.

Action: Defeated by Division III.

NO. 101 FIRST CONTEST OR DATE OF COMPETITION — DIVISION III FALL SPORTS

Intent: In sports in which NCAA championships occur in the fall, to specify that a Division III member institution shall not play its first contest or date of competition in the traditional segment prior to 11 weeks before the first NCAA championship contest in that sport. [Note: The following proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, page 209-320, for each sport in which the NCAA championship occurs in the fall, by amending the respective sections entitled "First Contest or Date of Competition," as follows:

[Division III only]

"17. First Contest or Date of Competition. In all sports in which the NCAA championship occurs in the fall, a member institution shall not play its first contest or date of competition (game or scrimmage) with outside competition prior to the following dates:

"17.___.2.1 Traditional Segment

"(b) Division III. August 15 11 weeks before the first NCAA championship contest in that sport."

Source: All eight members of the Empire Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: By allowing institutions to begin competition 11 weeks prior to the beginning of NCAA championship play, institutional academic schedules no longer will hinder team preparation or create problems related to the health and welfare of the student-athlete.

Action: Defeated by Division III.

NO. 102 PRESEASON BASKETBALL PRACTICE OPPORTUNITIES — DIVISION III BASKETBALL

[Note: This proposal was properly submitted per Constitution 5.3.3.1.1-(a) and was omitted inadvertently from the Initial and Second Publications of Proposed Legislation.]

Intent: To permit Division III member institutions to begin basketball practice 30 days prior to the first permissible contest date.

Bylaws: Amend 17.3.2.1, page 216, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.3.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to November 1 in Divisions I and II or, in Division III, 30 calendar days prior to the first permissible contest date per 17.3.3-(b)."

[Remainder of 17.3.2.1 unchanged.]

Source: All six members of the Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, Gallaudet College, Goucher College, Mary Washington College and York College.

Effective Date August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The research used to justify changing the starting date for basketball practice at the 1990 and 1991 NCAA Conventions was based on a study of demands placed on Division I studentathletes. Divisions I and III student-athletes encounter different problems, which is evidenced by the fact that Division III has an earlier first contest date in basketball; however, by establishing November 1 as the first practice date for all divisions, a problem concerning preparation time is created for Division III. During 1987-92, Division III teams averaged 34.6 (range 32-38) calendar days for practice prior to the first contest date. For the same period, Division I had 38-43 such days. Bylaw 17.3.2 allows Division III 15-22 practice days while Divisions I and II have 30 days. Division III student-athletes should be allowed an equivalent 30-day period. Division III teams, unlike Division I teams, spend time in tryouts because no athletics grants are awarded. That time and the time needed for skill development, conditioning, team strategy, scrimmages and proper rest requires more than 15-22 days. Practice would always begin after the current October 15 date. This amendment, along with other new legislation, will support the concept of less demands on student-athletes while allowing them time to prepare for the upcoming sea-

Action: Defeated by Division III.

NO. 103 PRESEASON PRACTICE OPPORTUNITIES — DIVISION III BASKETBALL

DIVIDION III
Intent: To eliminate the November 1 starting date for on-court pra
Legislative Proposals

tice in the sport of basketball in Division III and to permit member institutions 21 practice opportunities prior to the institution's first basketball contest.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.2.1, page 216, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.3.2.1 On-Court Practice. In Divisions I and II, A a member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to November 1. In Division III, a member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to the date that permits 21 practice opportunities (see 17.02.13) prior to the institution's first contest."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.3.1, page 216, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.3.3.1 Exceptions. The following basketball contests (games or scrimmages) are permitted prior to the first contest dates specified under 17.3.3:

[17,3,3,1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Practice Scrimmages — Division III. A maximum of two informal practice scrimmages with outside competition (conducted in privacy without publicity or official scoring) may be conducted between October 15 the start of on-court preseason practice and the conclusion of the basketball season. Such scrimmages need not be counted against the maximum permissible number of contests;"

Source: All 26 members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992

Rationale: This proposal would eliminate specific starting dates for on-court practice and, instead, permit each institution 21 practice opportunities prior to the institution's first basketball contest. An institution's 21-week playing season would begin whenever the institution starts practice, thus precluding any unfair competitive advantage as a result of varying starting practice dates. It is fair for everyone and even allows for institutional limitations on facility availability. This is a further step toward getting away from specified dates and coming up with a general standard for all sports.

Action: Defeated by Division III.

NO. 104 MAXIMUM CONTEST LIMITATIONS AND EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION III BASEBALL AND SOFTBALL

Intent: To reduce the number of contests in Division III baseball and softball from 45 to 42 (36 to 33 during the traditional segment), while exempting traditional segment contests played during an institution's vacation period during the academic year.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.2.4, pages 210-211, as follows:

A-130 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

[Division III only]

"17.2.4 Number of Contests

"17.2.4.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of baseball during the institution's baseball playing season to the following number of contests (games and scrimmages), except for those contests excluded under 17.2.4.2:

[17.2.4.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — 45 42 (with not more than 36 33 during the traditional segment).

[17.2.4.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.2.4.1.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in the following number of baseball contests (this limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

[17.2.4.1.2-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — 45 42 (with not more than 36 33 during the traditional segment).

"17.2.4.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of baseball contests shall exclude the following:

[17.2.4.2-(a) through 17.2.4.2-(f) unchanged.]

"(g) Vacation periods — Division III. Contests played during an official vacation period of the institution's academic year that occur during the traditional season."

[17.2.4.2-(g) through 17.2.4.2-(m), relettered as 17.2.4.2-(h) through 17.2.4.2-(n), unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.15.4, pages 279-280, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.15.4 Number of Contests

"17.15.4.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of softball during the institution's softball playing season in any one year to the following number of contests (games and scrimmages), except for those contests excluded under 17.15.4.2:

[17.15.4.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — 45 42 (with not more than 36 33 during the traditional segment).

[17.15.4.1.1 through 17 15.4.1.3 unchanged.]

"17.15.4.1.4 Maximum Limitations - Student-Athlete.

	A-I	3
Legislative Proposals		

An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in the following number of softball contests (this limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with -17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

[17.15.4.1.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III - 45 42 (with not more than 36 33 during the traditional segment).

"17.15.4.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of softball contests shall exclude the following:

[17.15.4.2-(a) through 17.15.4.2-(f) unchanged.]

"(g) Vacation Periods — Division III. Contests played during an official vacation period of the institution's academic year that occur during the traditional season."

{17.15.4.2-(g) through 17.15.4.2-(m), relettered as 17.15.4.2-(h) through 17.15.4.2-(n), unchanged.

Source: All 10 members of the New Jersey Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: In Division III, spring trips usually are financed by the student-athlete or through team fund raising. This also is applicable to those teams remaining in their local area with dormitories and food services closed. Also, more contests can be played during this period when the time demands of classes and study are not factors. Division III athletes enjoy competition just as much as do athletes in other divisions. Yet, in these sports, a greater difference in the number of contests allowed in the traditional seasons exists between divisions than in any other team sport. Reducing contests during the traditional segment of the academic year when classes are in session, but exempting contests during the vacation period will permit more contests without placing additional time demands on student-athletes.

Action: Defeated by Division III.

NO. 105 MAXIMUM CONTEST LIMITATIONS — DIVISION III BASEBALL

Intent: To permit Division III member institutions in the sport of baseball to compete in 50 contests during the academic year with no more than 40 to occur during the traditional segment.

Bylaws: Amend 17.2.4.1, pages 210-211, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.2.4.1 Maximum Limitations - Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of baseball during the institution's baseball

A-132 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

playing season to the following number of contests (games and scrimmages), except for those contests excluded under 17.2.4.2:

[17.2.4.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — 45 50 (with not more than 36 40 during the traditional segment).

[17.2.4.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.2.4.1.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in the following number of baseball contests (this limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

[17.2.4.1.2-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III - 45 50 (with not more than 36 40 during the traditional segment)."

[Remainder of 17.2.4 unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the Empire Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: Unpredictable weather conditions in the spring season often prevent programs from completing a full slate of contests. Allowing an increase in baseball contests to be scheduled will ensure a more representative schedule for most Division III baseball programs.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 106 MAXIMUM CONTEST LIMITATIONS -DIVISION III FOOTBALL

Intent: To permit Division III institutions to play 11 countable football contests but not more than 10 games (i.e., one scrimmage).

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.5.1, page 240, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.7.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total regular-season playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of football during the permissible football playing season in any one year to the following number of contests (games and scrimmages), except as provided for member institutions located in Alaska and Hawaii under 17.22.2, and except as provided for all members under 17.7.5.2: [17.7.5.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III - 10 11 (including not more than 10 games)."

Source: All 26 members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

	A-13
Legislative Proposals 🗕	 • •

Rationale: At the 1991 Convention, in an effort to support contest a reductions in Division I, Division III reduced the football season by one event. This was simply unnecessary. Time demands on Division III football student-athletes do not appear to be a problem as they are in Division I. The cutback is not a major cost saver because, in essence, it eliminates the opportunity for a scrimmage normally conducted between institutions in close proximity to each other.

Action: Defeated by Division III

NO. 107 MAXIMUM DATES OF COMPETITION LIMITATIONS — DIVISION III TENNIS

Intent: To reduce the dates of competition in Division III in the sport of tennis from 22 to 20 and to increase the number of permissible tournaments from three to four.

Bylaws: Amend 17.17.4.1, pages 291-292, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.17.4.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. In all divisions, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of tennis during the permissible tennis playing season to the following number of dates of competition, except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.17.4.2:

[17.17.4.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — 22 20 (including not more than three four individual singles and/or doubles tournaments that are counted as single dates of competition).

[17,17.4.1.1 through 17.17.4.1.3 unchanged.]

"17.17.4.1.4 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in the following number of dates of competition (this limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

[17.17.4.1.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — 22 **20** (including not more than three **four** individual singles and/or doubles tournaments that are counted as a single date of competition).

"17.17.4.1.4.1 Individual Singles or Doubles Tournament Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual singles or doubles tournament that does not include any team scoring or the recognition of a team champion shall count as a single date of competition (in not more than seven tournaments in Divisions I and II or three four tournaments in Division III) for the participating individuals, regardless of the number of days during

A-134 ________ 1992 Convention Proceedings

which tournament competition takes place."

[Remainder of 17.17.4 unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the Empire Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The sponsors of this proposal believe that it will make the playing season for tennis more consistent with what is in place or being proposed for other fall sports. Furthermore, it provides an opportunity for tournament competition beyond what is provided in the current legislation.

Action: Adopted by Division III.

NO. 108 DATES OF COMPETITION — DIVISION III WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL

Intent: To reduce from 22 to 20 the maximum number of dates of competition in Division III women's volleyball during the traditional segment

Bylaws: Amend 17 19.6.1, pages 304-305, as follows.

[Division III only]

"17.19.6.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of volleyball during the institution's volleyball playing season to the following number of dates of competition, except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.19.6.2:

[17.19.6.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(h) Division III:

[17.19.6.1-(b)-(1) unchanged.]

"(2) Women — 22 **20** during the traditional segment and five during the nontraditional segment.

[17.19.6.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.19.6.1.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in the following number of dates of competition in volleyball (this limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

[17.19.6.1.2-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III:

[17.19.6.1.2-(b)-(1) unchanged.]

"(2) Women — 22 20 during the traditional segment and five during the nontraditional segment."

Source: All eight members of the Empire Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

egislative Proposals	 A-13	5
Statement		

Rationale: The reduction of the traditional segment of the women's volleyball season makes it consistent with the limitation that currently is in place for soccer and with what is being proposed for other fall sports. The sponsors of this proposal believe that this also is in line with the cost-control and time-demand concerns expressed by the membership.

Action: Defeated by Division III. Originally adopted, motion to reconsider was approved.

Governance

NO. 109 DIVISION I COUNCIL AND PRESIDENTS COMMISSION REPRESENTATIVES

Intent: To revise the Division I composition of the NCAA Council and Presidents Commission to ensure that all men's basketballplaying conferences are represented on either the Council or the Presidents Commission.

A. Constitution: Amend 4.1.1.1, pages 17-19, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"4.1.1.1 Division I Representatives. The 22 Division I representatives shall include at least four individuals from each of the Division I representation regions (as set forth in 4.7.2.1) and also shall include:

[4.1.1.1-(a) through 4.1.1.1-(e) deleted.]

- "(a) One representative from Division I institutions that do not belong to a men's basketball-playing confer-
- "(b) A representative from each Division I men's basketball-playing conference not represented on the Presidents Commission per 4.5.1.1, and
- "(c) Remaining representatives selected at large."
- B. Constitution: Amend 4.5.1.1, page 23, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"4.5.1.1 Division I Representatives. The 22 Division I representatives shall include at least four from each of the four Division I representation regions (as set forth in 4.7.2.1) and also shall include:

[4.5.1.1-(a) through 4.5.1.1-(e) deleted.]

- "(a) One representative from Division I institutions that do not belong to a men's basketball-playing conference;
- "(b) A representative from each Division I men's basketball-playing conference not represented on the Council per 4.1.1.1, and
- "(c) Remaining representatives selected at large."

Source: All nine members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.

_____1992 Convention Proceedings

Effective Date: July 1, 1992. [The Division I membership of the Council and the Presidents Commission to be revised to meet the legislative requirements through attrition beginning July 1,

Rationale: Representation on the NCAA Council and Presidents Commission should reflect the entire spectrum of Division I conferences. This is better implemented by using men's basketballplaying conferences as the criteria for designated representation on the Commission and Council, rather than the current football-playing criteria. Restructuring reform has assured the football-playing conferences of legislative autonomy, while at the same time mandating stringent requirements for men's basketball-playing conferences. In addition, the above formula will result in Division I representation on the Commission that reflects the proportion of members within the division (I-A, 106 members, 36 percent; I-AA, 87 members, 29 percent, and I-AAA, 103 members, 35 percent). It also will maintain the current balance of Division I members on the Council to that of Divisions II and III members. Further, since the largest stream of revenue to the NCAA is produced through men's basketball, the men's basketball-playing conferences should be the conferences granted designated representation on the Council and Presidents Commission. Additionally, a broader range of Division I representation will allow for a fuller examination of topics by the Council and Presidents Commission and greater consensus building on the critical issues facing the NCAA.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 110 DIVISION I COUNCIL AND PRESIDENTS COMMISSION REPRESENTATIVES

Intent: To revise the Division I composition of the NCAA Council and Presidents Commission based upon representation of the subdivision membership of Division I

A. Constitution: Amend 4.1.1.1, pages 17-19, as follows: [Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"4.1.1.1 Division I Representatives. The 22 Division I representatives shall include at least four individuals from each of the Division I representation regions (as set forth in 4.7.2.1) and also shall include:

[4.1.1.1-(a) through 4.1.1.1-(e) deleted.]

- "(a) Eight representatives of Division I-A institutions, to be distributed equally among the four Division I representation regions;
- "(b) Six representatives of Division I-AA institutions, four of whom shall represent the four Division I-AA Football Championship regions, and
- "(c) Eight representatives of Division I institutions that do not play Division I-A or I-AA football, to be dis-

egislative Proposals	A-	137
egistative i roposate —		

tributed equally among the four Division I representation regions."

B. Constitution: Amend 4.5.1.1, page 23, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"4.5.1.1 Division I Representatives. The 22 Division I representatives shall include at least four individuals from each of the four Division I representation regions (as set forth in 4.7.2.1) and also shall include:

[4.5.1.1-(a) through 4.5.1.1-(e) deleted.]

- "(a) Eight representatives of Division I-A institutions, to be distributed equally among the four Division I representation regions:
- "(b) Six representatives of Division I-AA institutions, four of whom shall represent the four Division I-AA Football Championship regions, and
- "(c) Eight representatives of Division I institutions that do not play Division I-A or I-AA football, to be distributed equally among the four Division I representation regions."

Source: All nine members of the Northeast Conference.

- Effective Date: Immediately. [The Division I membership of the Council and the Presidents Commission to be revised to meet the legislative requirements through attrition beginning upon adjournment of the 1992 Convention.]
- Rationale: Division I representation on the NCAA Presidents Commission and Council should reflect the distribution of membership among the three Division I subdivisions. Such proportional representation will promote greater equity among the membership of the two bodies and contribute to the process of consensual policy decisions. Issues such as restructuring and revenue distribution will reflect more equitably the interests of those directly affected by policies of the Association. This proposal provides that the number of Division I representatives on each body will remain the same. However, proportional distribution on the basis of total subdivision membership will call for eight Division I-A, six Division I-AA and eight representatives from Division I institutions that do not play Division I-A or Division I-AA football instead of 12, five and five, respectively

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 111 CONFERENCE VOTING PRIVILEGES

Intent: To eliminate conference voting privileges.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.3.2.1 and 3.3.2.2, pages 11-12, as fol-

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"3.3.2 1 Privileges of Member Conferences. Member conferences shall be entitled to all of the privileges of active members except

the right to vote on issues before the Association and the right to compete as such in NCAA championships." [3.3.2.2 deleted.]

B. Constitution: Amend 5.1.3, pages 28-29, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5 1.3 Convention Delegates

"5 1.3.1 Institutional and Conference Delegates

"5,1,3 1 1 With Voting Privileges. Each active member and each member conference with voting privileges, as specified in 3.3.2.2, shall be entitled to one vote and may be represented by one to four accredited delegates.

"5 1.3 1.2 Without Voting Privileges, Each member conference without voting privileges shall be entitled to one accredited delegate without voting

"5.1.3.2 Conference Delegates. Each member conference may be represented by one to four accredited delegates without voting privileges."

[5.1.3.2 through 5.1.3.5, renumbered as 5.1.3.3 through 5.1.3.6. unchanged.)

[Note: 5.1.3.5 and 5 3.2 will be revised editorially if this proposal is adopted.]

Source: California State University, Fresno; Colorado State University; University of Florida; University of Georgia; Georgia Institute of Technology; Louisiana State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Oklahoma State University; Rice University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Since conference memberships vary in size, it is equitable to eliminate all conference votes in favor of institutional voting only.

Action: Not moved.

NO. 112 AMENDMENT — SPONSORSHIP

Intent: To specify that an amendment sponsored by a conference must be signed by the chair of the conference's official presidential administrative group or at least two chief executive officers of the conference's member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group.

Constitution: Amend 5.3 2.1, pages 32-33, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.3.2.1 Amendment. An amendment to a provision of the constitution or bylaws may be sponsored by:

[5.3.2.1-(a) through 5.3.2.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) A member conference with voting privileges when submitted

Legislative Proposals A-	13
--------------------------	----

by the chief elected or executive officer of the conference on. behalf of eight or more of its active member institutions and signed by the chair of the conference's official presidential administrative group or at least two chief executive officers of the conference's member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group, or"

[Remainder of 5.3.2.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Advisory Committee to Review the NCAA Governance Process).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will ensure that the chief executive officers. of a member conference play a more active role in the development of proposed legislation sponsored by that conference.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 113 AMENDMENTS TO FEDERATED PROVISIONS

Intent: To specify that proposed amendments to legislation that applies to more than one division or subdivision must be made available for a vote by all affected divisions or subdivisions, unless otherwise designated by the applicable division steering committee or the Council.

Constitution: Amend 5.3.2.1.1, page 33, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.3.2.1.1 Amendment, Federated Provision. When legislation is applicable only to a particular division, only members of that division or subdivision may submit amendments to that legislation. Proposed amendments to legislation submitted by the membership that applies to more than one division or subdivision may shall be voted on by all affected divisions or subdivisions, unless otherwise designated by the applicable steering committee or the Council."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: When reviewing legislative proposals submitted by the membership, the Legislative Review Committee often must decide whether proposals submitted for only one division should be made available for a vote by all affected divisions or subdivisions. The committee believes that it will be more consistent to require legislation submitted by the membership that applies to more than one division or subdivision to be made available for a vote by all affected divisions or subdivisions, unless the applicable steering committee or the Council determines that such a vote is not necessary.

Action: Adopted.

1992 Convention Proceedings A-140 _

NO. 114 REVISED LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

Intent: To revise the Association's legislative calendar by establishing new submission and publication dates for legislative proposals and resolutions.

Constitution: Amend 5.3, pages 32-36, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.3 AMENDMENT PROCESS

"5.3.1 Authorizing Legislation

[5.3.1.1 and 5.3.1.1.1 unchanged.]

"5.3.1.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. A proposed amendment to a provision of the constitution or bylaws may be amended at any annual or special Convention or at a division legislative meeting. From July 1 through September 1 August 1 through October 1, sponsors of proposed legislation may refine and change proposals in any manner that is germane to the original proposal, including revisions that are more or less restrictive than the original proposal. After September 1 October 1, proposed amendments may be amended only if the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the provision to be amended.

[5.3.2 unchanged.]

"5.3.3 Submission Deadline

"5.3.3.1 Amendment. Deadline dates for receipt at the national office of proposed amendments are as follows:

"5.3.3.1.1 Amendments Proposed by Membership

"(a) Annual Convention — July 1 August 1. Any amendment received after that date shall be postmarked not later than June 24.

[5.3.3.1.1-(b) and 5.3.3.1.1-(c) unchanged.]

"5.3.3.1.1.1 Exception. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after July 1 August 1.

"5.3.3.1.2. Amendments Sponsored by NCAA Council, Steering Committee or Presidents Commission

"(a) Annual Convention — August 15 October 1.

[5.3.3.1.2-(b) unchanged.]

"5.3.3.1.2.1 Exception. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after August 15 October 1.

"5.3.3.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. Sponsors of proposed amendments must submit amendments to their original proposals in writing not later than September 1 October 1, unless the amendment-to-amendment does not increase the

	A-141
egislative Proposals	

modification specified in the original proposal per 5.3.1:2.. Any amendment to a proposed amendment submitted after 3 September 1 October 1 shall not increase the modification of the original proposal and must be submitted in writing to the Association's national office not later than October 15.3 November 20 preceding an annual Convention (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked not later than October 8) or 60 days preceding a special Convention.

[5.3.3.2.1, 5.3.3.2.2 and 5.3.4 unchanged.]

"5.3.5 Notification to Membership

"5.3.5.1 Initial Publication. Proposed amendments shall be published for the information of the membership as follows:

- "(a) Not later than August 1 September 1 Those proposed by the membership, including the primary contact person's name, title and member institution or member conference, as well as the sponsors' statements of intent, and rationale and any proposals designated for inclusion by the Council, its steering committees, or the Presidents Commission; and
- "(b) Not later than September 15 November 1 Those submitted by the Council, a steering committee or the Presidents Commission and those modified by sponsors per 5.3.3.2, or

[Remainder of 5.3.5.1 unchanged.]

"5.3.5.2 Official Notice. A copy of the proposed amendments shall be mailed to all members of the Association not later than November 15 December 10 preceding an annual Convention, 45 days preceding a special Convention, or 30 days preceding a Division I-A or I-AA legislative meeting.

"5.3.5.3 Delayed Date. If the Council establishes a date later than July 1 August 1 or August 15 October 1 for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention, it, by a twothirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for publishing copies of the proposed amendments for information of the membership.

"5.3.5.4 Amendment-to-Amendment. Copies of all amendments to proposed amendments submitted by the proposal's original sponsors pursuant to the September 1 October 1 deadline shall be published by September 15 November 1. Copies of all other amendments to proposed amendments submitted by the October 15 November 20 deadline shall be published in the Official Notice of the Convention."

[Remainder of 5.3 unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend 5.4.2.4, page 38, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote] "5.4.2.4 Submission Deadline. A proposed resolution must be submitted in writing to the national office prior to October 15 November 15."

_____1992 Convention Proceedings

[Remainder of 5.4.2.4 unchanged.]

Source: All nine members of the Atlantic Coast Conference; all 10 members of the Big East Conference; all 11 members of the Big Ten Conference; all seven members of the Patriot League; all 11 members of the Southeastern Conference; Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; Stanford University; University of Washington, and Washington State University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current legislative calendar requires legislative proposals to be submitted during the summer prior to the Collegiate Commissioners Association meeting and some conference meetings, and the review period for such proposals occurs later during the summer when many institutional representatives are absent from campus. The deadline for amendments-to-amendments is October 15, prior to most conference winter meetings. The proposed legislative calendar would permit the review process for membership-sponsored amendments to occur during the early fall months when institutional representatives have returned to campus, allow the Presidents Commission, Council and division steering committees to use their fall meetings to finalize their amendments, and permit conferences to review the proposals and sponsor amendments-to-amendments at their winter meetings.

Action: Defeated (391-238, two abstentions), two-thirds approval required.

NO. 115 LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES — SUBMISSION DATES AND TIMES

Intent: To confirm that legislative amendments, sponsor modifications of amendments and amendments-to-amendments must be received at the national office by 5 p.m. Central time on the applicable deadline date, and to eliminate the "postmark-deadline" exceptions related to the submission of such proposed legisla-

Constitution: Amend 5.3.3, pages 33-35, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.3.3 Submission Deadline

"5.3.3.1 Amendment. Deadline dates for receipt at the national office of proposed amendments are as follows:

"5.3.3.1.1 Amendment Proposed by Membership

"(a) Annual Convention — 5 p.m. Central time July 1. Any amendment received after that date shall be postmarked not later than June 24.

[Remainder of 5.3.3.1 unchanged.]

"5.3.3.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. Sponsors of proposed amendments must submit amendments to their original

	A-	14	3
Legislative Proposals			

proposals in writing and such amendments must be received at the Association's national office not later than 5 p.m. Central time September 1, unless the amendment-to-amendment does not increase the modification specified in the original proposal per 5.3.1.2. Any amendment to a proposed amendment submitted after September 1 shall not increase the modification of the original proposal. and must be submitted in writing to and received at the Association's national office not later than 5 p.m. Central time October 15 preceding an annual Convention (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked not later than October 8) or 60 days preceding a special Convention."

[Remainder of 5.3.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal confirms and codifies a long-established administrative practice related to the hours during which legislative proposals must be submitted. With the increased ability ? of member institutions to submit legislative proposals through overnight mail services and facsimiles, the "postmark-deadline"; exception has become unnecessary and should be deleted.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 115-1 LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES — SUBMISSION DATES AND TIMES

Intent: To change the submission deadline for legislative amendments, sponsor modifications of amendments and amendmentsto-amendments from 5 p.m. to midnight Central time.

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 115, 5.3.3, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.3.3 Submission Deadline

"5.3.3.1 Amendment. Deadline dates for receipt at the national office of proposed amendments are as follows:

"5.3.3.1.1 Amendment Proposed by Membership

"(a) Annual Convention — 5 p.m. Midnight Central time July 1.

[Remainder of 5.3.3.1 unchanged.]

"5.3.3.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. Sponsors of proposed amendments must submit amendments to their original proposals in writing and such amendments must be received at the Association's national office not later than 5 p.m. midnight Central time September 1, unless the amendment-toamendment does not increase the modification specified in the original proposal per 5.3.1.2. Any amendment to a proposed amendment submitted after September 1 shall not increase the modification of the original proposal and must be submitted in writing and received at the Association's na-

_ 1992 Convention Proceedings

tional office not later than 5pm midnight Central time October 15 preceding an annual Convention or 60 days preceding a special Convention."

[Remainder of 5.3.3 unchanged.]

Source: All 11 members of the Big West Conference.

Rationale: This amendment-to-amendment would allow all institutions across the country (from the east to Hawaii) to utilize their entire workday for meeting the submission deadlines. Since automatic facsimile machines date and time all receptions, it would not be necessary to physically have a person in the national office to monitor the submissions until midnight.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 116 RESOLUTION: BIENNIAL LEGISLATIVE CONVENTION

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the Association has adopted a plethora of legislation during recent Conventions; and

"Whereas, the NCAA membership has had a difficult time absorbing all of the legislation that has been adopted in recent years; and "Whereas, the Association's annual legislative calendar in many

cases has exacerbated this problem;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council and Presidents Commission review the Association's current annual legislative calendar and consider sponsoring legislation at the 1993 Convention that would establish a biennial legislative Convention and, in alternate years, a nonlegislative Convention to include forums and roundtable discussions on specific proposals regarding issues affecting the interests of the various membership divisions."

Source: Boston College; Colorado State University; University of Georgia; Georgia Institute of Technology; Louisiana State University; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Oklahoma State University; Rice University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin, and University of Wyoming.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 117 RESOLUTION: COUNCIL WAIVER AUTHORITY

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the NCAA Council Subcommittee to Review NCAA Legislative Procedures has reviewed the possible establishment of increased authority for the NCAA Council to grant waivers of the Association's legislation; and

"Whereas, the subcommittee recognizes the concerns inherent in such increased waiver authority, such as the possibility of numerous waiver requests and the possibility of increased vulnerability to litigation; and

"Whereas, the subcommittee and the Council have concluded

Legislative Proposals ______

that these concerns are significant and merit further study; and

"Whereas, the subcommittee and the Council have concluded that, despite the potential drawbacks, the idea of establishing increased waiver authority for the Council remains appealing; and

"Whereas, situations continue to arise in which such authority could reasonably and effectively be employed;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Council further study the issue of establishing increased Council waiver authority; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Council, if it concludes that such action is appropriate, sponsor legislation to establish such increased waiver authority for action at the January 1993 NCAA Convention."

Source: NCAA Council (Subcommittee to Review NCAA Legislative Procedures).

Action: Adopted.

General

NO. 118 DIVISION-SPECIFIC PLAYING RULES

Intent: To permit the division championships committees to consider and approve appeals for division-specific exceptions to the applicable playing rules, subject to the final authority of the Executive Committee.

A. Bylaws: Amend 21.3.4.2, page 371, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.4.2 Duties. The committee shall:

[21.3.4.2-(a) and 21.3.4.2-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations in the areas of player safety, financial impact and image of the sport and approve appeals for division-specific exceptions to the applicable playing regulations when significant financial impact may occur (subject to the final authority of the Executive Committee),"

[Remainder of 21.3.4.2 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 21.3.5.2, page 371, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.5.2 Duties. The committee shall:

[21.3.5.2-(a) and 21.3.5.2-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations in the areas of player safety, financial impact and image of the sport and approve appeals for division-specific exceptions to the applicable playing regulations when significant financial impact may occur (subject to the final authority of the Executive Committee):"

[Remainder of 21.3.5.2 unchanged.]

A-146 _______ 1992 Convention Proceedings

C. Bylaws: Amend 21.3.6.2, page 372, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.6.2 Duties. The committee shall:

[21.3.6.2-(a) and 21.3.6.2-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations in the areas of player safety, financial impact and image of the sport and approve appeals for division-specific exceptions to the applicable playing regulations when significant financial impact may occur (subject to the final authority of the Executive Committee);"

[Remainder of 21,3,6.2 unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 21.4.1.3, page 377, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21 4.1.3 Duties. Subject to the final authority of the Executive Committee, each rules committee shall establish and maintain rules of play in its sport consistent with the sound traditions of the sport and of such character as to ensure good sportsmanship and safe participation by the competitors. These playing rules shall be common for all divisions of the Association, and differences among the divisions shall not be permitted, except for the division-specific playing regulations developed to address significant financial impact and approved by the division championships committees and the Executive Committee pursuant to 21.3.4.2-(c), 21.3.5.2-(c) and 21.3.6.2-(c)."

E. Bylaws: Amend 21.5.1.5.2, pages 378-379, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.5.1.5.2 Rules of Play. Subject to the final authority of the Executive Committee, each rules committee shall establish and maintain rules of play in its sport consistent with the sound traditions of the sport and of such character as to ensure good sportsmanship and safe participation by the competitors. These playing rules shall be common for all divisions of the Association, and differences among the divisions shall not be permitted, except for the division-specific playing regulations developed to address significant financial impact and approved by the division championships committees and the Executive Committee pursuant to 21.3.4.2-(c), 21.3.5.2-(c) and 21.3.6.2-(c)."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: At the 1991 Convention, the membership, through the adoption of Proposal No. 63, expressed a desire for flexibility in the administration of the Association's playing rules to accommodate the financial concerns of specific membership divisions. This proposal was developed by the Executive Committee, the

Legislative Proposals A-	147
--------------------------	-----

Divisions I, II and III Championships Committees and an ad hoc committee to address that concern. It will permit the division championships committees to consider and approve appeals for division-specific exceptions to the applicable playing rules when a playing rule may have a significant monetary impact on the membership of a division. In addition, criteria for the approval of appeals will be developed to safeguard against the deterioration of the structural integrity of a sport.

Action: Adopted by all three divisions.

NO. 119 SURGICAL EXPENSES

Intent: To permit member institutions to provide surgical expenses to student-athletes (including partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers) who are injured during the academic year while participating in voluntary physical activities that will prepare them for competition.

A. Bylaws: Amend 16.4.1, pages 186-187, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.4.1 Permissible. Identified medical expense benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics that may be financed by the institution are:

[16.4.1-(a) through 16.4.1-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) Surgical expenses to a student-athlete (including a partial qualifier or a nonqualifier) who is injured during the academic year while participating in voluntary physical activities that will prepare the student-athlete for competition;"

[16.4.1-(i) and 16.4.1-(j), relettered as 16.4.1-(j) and 16.4.1-(k), unchanged.l

B. Bylaws: Amend 16.4.2, page 187, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.4.2 Nonpermissible. Student-athlete medical expense benefits that may not be financed by the institution are:

[16.4.2-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Surgical expenses to treat a student-athlete's illness or injury that was not a result of practice for or participation in intercollegiate athletics at the institution and did not occur during voluntary physical activities that will prepare the student-athlete for competition;"

[Remainder of 16.4.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Current legislation does not permit member institutions to provide surgical expenses to student-athletes who are injured during the academic year while participating in voluntary physical activities preparing them for competition. These activities

______1992 Convention Proceedings

often are encouraged by coaches, and because of resultant liability risks, the Interpretations Committee and Council believe that it is appropriate that member institutions be permitted to pay for such expenses.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 120 ATHLETICS HOUSING

Intent: To preclude Division I member institutions from housing student-athletes in athletics blocks in privately owned dormitories or apartment buildings.

Bylaws: Amend 16.5.2.2, page 188, as follows:

[Division I only]

"16.5.2.2 Athletics Housing. The institution may not house student-athletes in athletics dormitories or athletics blocks within institutional or private dormitories or apartment buildings on those days when institutional dormitories are open to the general student body.

[16.5.2.2.1 unchanged.]

"16.5.2.2.2 Athletics Blocks. Athletics blocks shall be defined as individual blocks, wings or floors within institutional dormitories or privately owned dormitories or apartment buildings in which at least 50 percent of the residents are student-athletes."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1996.

Rationale: This proposal is consistent with the objective of legislation adopted by the membership at the 1991 NCAA Convention to integrate student-athletes more completely into the student body and to enable student-athletes to experience every facet of college life similar to students in general. A four-year phase-in period is permitted to allow institutions ample opportunity to adjust to this legislation.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 121 INDOOR AND OUTDOOR TRACK — MINIMUM CONTESTS

Intent: To reduce from six to five the minimum number of contests in indoor track and outdoor track that are required to fulfill sports-sponsorship criteria.

Bylaws: Amend 20.9.3.3, pages 352-353, as follows:

[Division I only]

"20.9.3.3 Minimum Contests and Participants Requirements for Sports Sponsorship. In each sport, the institution's team shall engage in at least a minimum number of intercollegiate contests (against four-year, degree-granting collegiate institutions) each year. In the individual sports, the institution's team shall in-

egislative Proposals A	4-1	49

clude a minimum number of participants in each contest that is and counted toward meeting the minimum-contests requirement. The following minimums are applicable:

Minimum Minimum "Individual Participants Contests Sports 14 "Track, Indoor 6 **5** 14" 6 **5** Track, Outdoor

[Remainder of 20.9.3.3 unchanged.]

Source: All nine members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: Current legislation requiring institutions to schedule a minimum of six indoor track meets and six outdoor track meets in order to meet the minimum-contests requirement of the sports-sponsorship legislation often results in outdoor meets being scheduled too soon after the conclusion of the indoor season. Student-athletes may not have adequate time to recover from their indoor season training regimen and be forced to compete outdoors without the proper preparation. Reducing the number of contests required by one would permit institutions to delay for a short period of time the scheduling of their early season outdoor meets and permit student-athletes adequate time to prepare for the outdoor season.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 122 MINIMUM CONTESTS - INDOOR AND OUTDOOR TRACK

Intent: To reduce from 12 to 10 the total number of indoor and outdoor track meets in which a Division I institution must participate to receive credit for sponsoring both sports.

Bylaws: Amend 20.9.3.3.6, page 353, as follows:

[Division I only]

"20.9.3.3.6 Indoor and Outdoor Track. A Division I institution may receive credit for sponsoring both indoor and outdoor track, provided its team participates in a total of at least 12 10 indoor and outdoor meets during the year, including at least four indoor and four outdoor meets."

Source: All nine members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The current rule often results in outdoor meets being scheduled too soon after the conclusion of the indoor season. Student-athletes may not have adequate time to recover from their indoor season training regimen and be forced to compete outdoors without the proper preparation. Reducing to 10 the total number of required indoor and outdoor meets during the year (while maintaining the requirement that each sport compete in at least four meets) would allow institutions the opportunity to

______1992 Convention Proceedings

either slightly shorten the indoor season or slightly delay the start of the outdoor season and permit student-athletes adequate recovery and preparation time between seasons.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 123 RESOLUTION: NCAA PAPERWORK

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, during the last decade there has been a proliferation in the amount of paperwork that must be filed by the membership, including the Certification of Compliance for Institutions (Form 91-1), Certificate of Compliance for Staff Members of Athletics Departments (91-2), Student-Athlete Statement (Form 91-3), Student-Athletes' Affirmation of Eligibility (Form 91-4), Squad List (Form 91-5), Graduation Rates Disclosure Form (Form 91-6) and the Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG); and

"Whereas, this proliferation has led to greatly increased administrative costs for member institutions, directing needed resources

away from athletics programs and student-athletes; and

"Whereas, a program to certify coaches is scheduled to begin in August 1992 and the NCAA membership is contemplating a required accreditation program for member institutions that will further increase administrative burdens; and

"Whereas, within the NCAA administrative structure, the development of compliance services is resulting in a proliferation of wellintended paperwork designed to prevent rules violations, while mul-

tiplying the paperwork load for athletics programs;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council appoint a Special Committee to Streamline NCAA Paperwork to review recommendations to streamline the paperwork required of member institutions and to study the proliferation of required filings with the intent of decreasing the amount of such documentation through the better coordination of required information; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the special committee develop recommendations to be presented to the NCAA Council and that legislation consistent with those recommendations be sponsored by the

Council for consideration at the 1993 NCAA Convention."

Source. All nine members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference. Action: Defeated.

NO. 124 RESOLUTION: STUDENT-ATHLETE COMMITTEES

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, in the past few years, an increased concern regarding the academic, social and athletics welfare of student-athletes has led to an increased interest in obtaining information regarding studentathletes' intercollegiate athletics experiences; and

"Whereas, in November 1988, the NCAA released a series of reports summarizing the results of the 1987-88 national study of intercollegiate athletics conducted by the American Institutes for Re-

t to to Dominanta	A-	15	
egislative Proposals			

search that provided significant data regarding the effects of partici-

pation in intercollegiate athletics on student-athletes; and

"Whereas, the NCAA membership at the 1989 NCAA Convention established the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, the purpose of which was to receive information on and explanations of NCAA activities and legislation and to seek input and insight regarding the experiences of student-athletes; and

"Whereas, the NCAA membership, during the 1991 NCAA Convention, adopted a proposal to require Division I member institutions to conduct exit interviews from a sample of student-athletes following the expiration of their eligibility in an effort to encourage the development of intercollegiate athletics programs that are responsive to the needs and interests of participating student-athletes; and

"Whereas, such exit interviews will only recognize the concerns of those student-athletes who are leaving athletics programs and the

NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is limited in its ability to obtain feedback from a broad range of student-athletes from vari-

ous member institutions and member conferences;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that in an effort to establish a 'grass roots' network for obtaining information and input on the stu-dent-athlete's experience, each NCAA institution and conference consider establishing student-athlete committees, and

"Be It Further Resolved, that legislation be submitted for consideration at the 1993 Convention to encourage the establishment of student-athlete committees at the institutional and conference levels if the NCAA Council determines such action to be appropriate."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; University of Florida; University of Georgia; Mississippi State University; University of North Texas; University of South Carolina, Columbia; University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and Vanderbilt University

Action: Adopted.

Recruiting

NO. 125 RECRUITING CALENDARS — DIVISION I SPORTS OTHER THAN FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL

Intent: To establish a 93-day "floating" recruiting calendar in Division I sports other than football and basketball.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3, page 86, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.3 Recruiting Calendars. Recruiting calendars limiting contact and evaluation periods apply in all sports in Division I and the sports of basketball and football in Divisions I and II and also include recruiting dead periods in all sports in those divisions. The Council shall have the authority to establish in the Administrative Regulations such calendars for Divisions I and II sports.

"13.1.3.1 Banquets and Meetings. A member of the basketball

_ 1992 Convention Proceedings A-152 ____

or toothall coaching staff may speak at a meeting or banquet outside the recruiting contact periods (except for dead periods per 13.02.4.4), provided:

[Remainder of 13.1.3.1 unchanged.]

"13.1.3.2 Waiver of Contact Period. The Council shall have the authority, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, to waive provisions of the football and basketball contact periods for institutions with established admissions acceptance dates that occur after the normal contact deadline.'

B. Bylaws: Amend 30.9, pages 395-400, as follows:

[Division I only]

"30.9 RECRUITING CALENDARS

[30.9.1 through 30.9.6 unchanged.]

"30.9.7 Recruiting Calendars For Other Division I Sports. In Division I sports other than football and basketball, the contact and evaluation of prospective student-athletes from August 1 through July 31 shall be limited to a 93-day calendar, excluding the dead periods specified in 30.9.8, selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics prior to the first day of recruiting. All travel activities related to recruiting shall occur within the 93day calendar.

"30.9.7 30.9.8 Dead Periods for Other Sports. There are no specified contact and evaluation periods in sports other than football and basketball except for the 'floating' recruiting calendar in Division I per 30.9.7 and except for the following dead pe-

[30.9.7.1 through 30.9.7.5, renumbered as 30.9.8.1 through 30.9.8.5, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: During the 1991 Convention, the Division I membership adopted 1991 Convention Proposal No. 25, a resolution concerning recruiting periods. The resolution was a part of the reform package and was proposed by the NCAA Special Committee on Cost Reduction. It was the special committee's belief that further restricting the time periods during which an institution may contact and evaluate prospective student-athletes off the institution's campus will reduce institutional spending by limiting the amount of time and travel incurred in off-campus recruiting activities and will provide more opportunity for athletics department staff members to remain on campus during key periods of the academic year. Accordingly, the NCAA Recruiting Committee contacted each Division I sports coaches' association and requested recommendations to reduce the time periods during

egislative Proposals	 A-153
egislative Proposals	 M-13.

which authorized athletics department staff members may recruit prospective student-athletes off campus to approximately three months (93 days). The results of this survey supported the establishment of the "floating" recruiting calendar described in this proposal.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 126 RECRUITING — COLLECT AND TOLL-FREE TELEPHONE CALLS

Intent: To permit member institutions to accept collect telephone calls and to utilize toll-free (1-800) telephone numbers to receive telephone calls from prospective student-athletes at any time.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.4-(b)-(1), page 85, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(1) Collect Telephone Calls. Institutional staff members may accept collect telephone calls and may utilize a toll-free (1-800) number to receive telephone calls placed by prospective student-athletes, prospects' parents or legal guardians at any time."

Source: NCAA Council.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will permit prospective student-athletes, at their discretion, to place telephone calls to member institutions. Because all telephone calls pursuant to this legislation will be placed at the prospects' discretion, the proposal will not create increased recruiting pressures and will permit institutions to provide important information to prospects as the need arises throughout the recruiting process.

Action: Defeated by Division I (154-155) and adopted by Division II (104-88, one abstention).

NO. 127 RECRUITING — TOLL-FREE TELEPHONE CALLS

Intent: To eliminate the use of toll-free (1-800) telephone numbers from the recruiting process.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.4 by adding new 13.1.2.4-(b)-(2), page 85, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(2) Toll-Free Telephone Calls. An institution may not utilize a toll-free (1-800) number to receive telephone calls from prospective student-athletes, prospects' parents or legal guardians."

Source: All nine members of the Atlantic Coast Conference and all 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Although the NCAA Interpretations Committee originally determined that an institution may not use toll-free numbers

_____1992 Convention Proceedings

to receive telephone calls from prospective student-athletes, the Council in its April 1991 meeting reversed that interpretation. The result was that institutions implemented 1-800 telephone numbers and that toll-free calls made by prospects do not count within the once-per-week limit. The sponsors of this amendment believe that the use of a 1-800 telephone number is contrary to the intent of the original legislation and could lead to additional

Action: Adopted by Division I (185-124); moot in Division II due to adoption of No. 126.

NO. 128 RECRUITING — TELEPHONE CALLS

Intent: To permit athletics department staff members to make unlimited telephone contacts during the two-day "dead period" immediately prior to the initial date for signing the National Letter of In-

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.4, by adding new 13.1.2.4-(b)-(2), page 85, as

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football, divided votel

"(2) Football Dead-Period Exception. Institutional staff members in the sport of football may make unlimited telephone calls to prospective student-athletes during the 'dead periods' immediately prior to the initial signing dates for the National Letter of Intent in the sport of football."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately

Rationale: Football is the only sport with limitations on the number of initial financial aid awards, and the initial awards limitation in that sport (25 grants in Division I-A and 30 in Division I-AA) is larger than the total financial aid limitation for any other sport. These two factors establish a necessity for the coaching staff to have instant knowledge of the numbers of prospects who intend to sign National Letters of Intent (with accompanying financial aid tenders). The ability to contact prospects by telephone (but not in person) would enable the coaching staff to seek this information while not undermining the philosophy of the "dead period."

Action: Adopted by Divisions I-A and I-AA after being postponed to the Division I business session; not moved in Division II. Originally defeated in Division I-AA, it was adopted after a successful motion to reconsider.

NO. 129 RECRUITING — TELEPHONE CALLS

con	n Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football, to preclude telephon ct with a prospective student-athlete prior to August 15 fol ng the completion of the prospect's junior year in hig nd; to limit telephone contact to once per week from Augus
	· ·

Legislative Proposals	A-15
egislative Proposals	

during one calendar day. It is permissible for this contact to occur both at the site of the prospect's educational institution and one such contact away from the institutional grounds. During such contacts, the head coach may be accompanied by an assistant(s) who otherwise is required to observe the restrictions contained in the bylaws."

Source: NCAA Council (Subcommittee to Review 1991 Reform Proposals); all nine members of the Atlantic Coast Conference; all 11 members of the Big Ten Conference; all 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference; University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; University of Georgia; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; Mississippi State University; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Syracuse University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Texas A&M University; Texas Tech University; West Virginia University, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: The current rule permits the head coach to visit a prospect on two separate days and virtually requires a Division I-A head football coach to make two of the three permissible off-campus recruiting contacts with a prospect. The previous rule, permitting the head coach to make a recruiting contact on only one calendar day, worked well and should be reinstituted.

Action: Adopted by Division I-A.

NO. 131 PERMISSIBLE CONTACTS

Intent: To permit one contact per week at the prospect's educational institution in Divisions I-A and I-AA football; to permit not more than three contacts at the prospect's educational institution in other sports in Division I and all sports in Division II, and to establish a maximum of three additional contacts at other sites in all sports.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4, pages 94-95, as follows:

"13.1.4 Permissible Number of Contacts. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, one contact per prospect is permitted at the prospect's educational institution during each week of the contact period on the occasion of the once-a-week visit, and three contacts shall be permitted at other sites. In all other sports, Eeach institution shall be limited to three in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect at any site [which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) but which shall not include contacts made during the official visit to campus per 13.7] prior to and on the occasion when the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent. Institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of prospects enrolled in the

institution. Visiting a prospect's institution on consecutive days during a particular week to observe a tournament or tier of a tournament shall count as a single visit. All such visits must receive the approval of the executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative) of the prospect's educational institution."

[Remainder of 13.1.4 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4, pages 94-95, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote] "13.1.4 Permissible Number of Contacts. In all sports other than Divisions I-A and I-AA football, each institution shall be permitted not more than three in-person, offcampus recruiting contacts per prospect at the prospect's educational institution and not more than three contacts at other sites. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, Feach institution shall be limited to three in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect at any site [which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) but which shall not include contacts made during the official visit to campus per 13.7] prior to and on the occasion when the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent. Institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of prospects enrolled in the institution. Visiting a prospect's institution on consecutive days during a particular week to observe a tournament or tier of a tournament shall count as a single visit. All such visits must receive the approval of the executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative) of the prospect's educational institution."

[Remainder of 13.1.4 unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Clemson University; Florida State University; University of Georgia; University of Kansas, Kansas State University; Mississippi State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Pennsylvania State University; Syracuse University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Texas A&M University; Texas Tech University; West Virginia University, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to allow an institution's staff adequate opportunities during the recruiting process to personally assimilate information on the character of a prospective student-athlete. It is important to remember that in recent years off-campus recruiting in football has been reduced from over 200 days to less than eight weeks. There are dead periods of December 24 through January 1 and the days assigned to the annual convention of the American Football Coaches Association, along with the movement of the National Letter of In-

<u> </u>	A-15
Legislative Proposals	

tent signing date to the first Wednesday after the first Tuesday in February and an additional 48-hour dead period before the signing date. The proposed amendment, which was in effect prior to August 1, 1991, was easily understood by an institution's football staff, enforceable and easy to administer. It required no decisions on the part of a staff member as to what constitutes a contact or evaluation and eliminated the practice of the "bump."

Action: Part A was defeated by Division I-A (56-61); not moved in Division I-AA. Part B was not moved.

NO. 132 FOOTBALL — VISITS TO HIGH SCHOOL

Intent: To limit an institution to three visits to the prospect's educational institution during the contact period and to eliminate the single-visit tournament exception in the sport of football.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4, pages 94-95, as follows: Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football, divided votel

"13.1.4 Permissible Number of Contacts. Each institution shall be limited to three in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect at any site [which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) but which shall not include contacts made during an official visit to campus per 13.7] prior to and on the occasion when the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent. Institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of prospects enrolled in the institution. In the sport of football, institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than three days during the football contact period. In sports other than football, wisiting a prospect's institution on consecutive days during a particular week to observe a tournament or a tier of a tournament shall count as a single visit. All such visits must receive the approval of the executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative) of the prospect's educational institution." [Remainder of 13.1.4 unchanged.]

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: Under the current rule, a football coach may visit a high school once a week during the recruiting contact period (a maximum of 10 times during the 1991-92 recruiting season). The NCAA Special Committee on Cost Reduction had intended to reduce the number of visits to a high school by limiting to four the number of evaluations the football staff could make and defining a visit to a high school during which no contact occurred as an evaluation for all prospects in that sport at the high school. However, coaches may identify "bogus" prospects at a high

_____1992 Convention Proceedings

school and continue to make numerous visits to the high school, making contacts with several different prospects while letting the prospect they really are recruiting know they are in the high school. This proposal would eliminate this practice.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I-A and I-AA; not moved in Division II.

NO. 133 FOOTBALL EVALUATIONS

Intent: To eliminate the limitation on the number of evaluation opportunities for Division I-A staff members during the applicable contact and evaluation periods, except for the May evaluation

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.6, page 96, as follows: [Division I-A football only]

"13.1.6 Limitations on Number of Evaluations — All Sports.

"13.1.6.1 Division I-A Football. In Division I-A football, there is no limit on the number of evaluations of a prospective student-athlete by institutional staff members during the applicable contact and evaluation periods, except as specified in 13.1.6.3 helow.

"13.1.6.2 All Other Sports. In all sports other than Division I-A football, institutional staff members shall not evaluate a prospective student-athlete on more than four occasions during the academic year during which the prospect competes or practices on any team (e.g., high-school team, all-star team, club team)."

[13.1 6.1 and 13.1.6.2, renumbered as 13.1.6.3 and 13.1.6.4, unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Baylor University; University of Cincinnati; Clemson University; East Carolina University; Georgia Institute of Technology; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; Mississippi State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Syracuse University, University of Texas at Austin; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Texas Christian University; Texas Tech University, and West Virginia University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to permit the football staff of a Division I-A institution to evaluate adequately the athletics abilities of a prospective student-athlete during the applicable contact and evaluation periods. Allowing only four evaluations (one of which must be reserved for the May evaluation period) during Fridays in October, November 1 through November 30 and the 15 days in May for the number of prospective student-athletes reviewed by a football staff makes the task of effective recruiting extremely difficult. With increased emphasis on the academic capabilities of student-athletes, coupled with

	A-161
Legislative Proposals	

the limitations to be implemented on squad size, it is important that the proper decisions be made by an institution with respect to offering a grant-in-aid to a prospect. The means by which those decisions will be made is through evaluation. The number of student-athletes reviewed by an institution's football staff is unique to that sport; thus, the need exists for more evaluation opportunities than other sports that recruit and evaluate relatively small numbers of prospects.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A.

NO. 134 FOOTBALL EVALUATIONS

- Intent: To define the period for counting the four permissible evaluations in the sport of football from May 1 of the prospect's junior year in high school through the prospect's senior year, or until he has signed a National Letter of Intent, whichever occurs earlier.
- Bylaws: Amend 13.1.6 by adding new 13.1.6.1, page 96, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football, divided vote]

"13.1.6.1 Time Period for Counting Football Evaluations. In the sport of football, the time period during which the four permissible evaluations may take place shall be from May 1 of the prospect's junior year in high school through the following academic year or until the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent, whichever occurs earlier."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference and all 11 members of the Southeastern Conference.

Effective Date: May 1, 1992.

- Rationale: The current time period for counting a prospect's four permissible evaluations is the academic year of the prospect's educational institution. However, football coaches begin their evaluations in May of the prospect's junior year in high school and continue to evaluate through the prospect's senior season. This proposal would place the limit on evaluations within the true football recruiting period.
- **Action:** Adopted by Division I-A as amended by No. 134-1. Adopted by Division I-AA. Originally defeated by I-AA, it was adopted after a successful motion to reconsider.

NO. 134-1 FOOTBALL EVALUATIONS

Intent: To clarify that Proposal No. 134 is intended to establish a different evaluation time period for all prospects in the sport of football, not just rising seniors.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 134, 13.1.6.1, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football, divided vote]

A-162 ________ 1992 Convention Proceedings

"13.1.6.1 Time Period for Counting Football Evaluations. In the sport of football, the time period during which the four permissible evaluations may take place shall be from May 1 **through April 30** of the prospect's junior year in high school through the following academic year or until the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent, whichever occurs earlier."

- Source: University of Arizona; Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; University of Southern California; Stanford University; University of Washington, and Washington State University.
- Rationale: The intent of Proposal 134 is to establish a different evaluation period for the sport of football. Unfortunately, the proposal is flawed because it creates a 13-month evaluation period for highschool football players who do not sign National Letters of Intent. This amendment-to-amendment will correct that deficiency.

Action: Adopted by Division I-A, defeated by Division I-AA.

NO. 135 EVALUATIONS — DIVISION I FOOTBALL

Intent: In Division I football, to eliminate Fridays during the month of October as an evaluation period.

Bylaws: Amend 30.9.5, page 399, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]
"30.9.5 Football, Division I. The following contact and evaluation
periods shall apply to football in Division I:

"(a) June 1 through October 31 [except for (b) below] Quiet Period
"(b) Findays during the month of October Evaluation Penod"
[30.9.5-(c) through 30.9.5-(k), relettered as 30.9.5-(b) through 30.9.5-(j), unchanged.]

Source: University of Arizona; Arizona State University; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; Stanford University; University of Washington, and Washington State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: Recruiting on Fridays in October is expensive for institutions in rural areas and takes coaches away from the team just prior to a contest. The proposal returns the rule to the way it existed in 1989.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I-A (47-64) and I-AA.

NO. 136 EVALUATIONS — DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, to permit Saturdays to be computed into the 15 consecutive days of the May evaluation period.

egislative Proposals	63
----------------------	----

Bylaws: Amend 30.9.5, page 399, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote] "30.9.5 Football, Division I. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to football in Division I:

[30.9.5-(a) through 30.9.5-(i) unchanged.]

"(j) Fifteen consecutive weekdays (Monday through Friday) days (excluding Sundays) during May 1 through May 31 selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics:

Evaluation Period"

[Remainder of 30.9.5 unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Baylor University, University of Cincinnati; Clemson University; East Carolina University; Georgia Institute of Technology; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; Mississippi State University; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Syracuse University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin; Texas Christian University; Texas Tech University; West Virginia University, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The purpose of the amendment is to allow an institution's coaching staff the use of Saturdays as part of its 15 days of evaluation in May. In certain areas of the country there are many high-school athletics events conducted on Saturdays that afford a valuable opportunity for evaluation of a prospective student-athlete's athletics abilities. Further, in some instances, it is more economical to utilize weekend rates for transportation and housing. Also, the ability to use Saturday would reduce the number of days a coach would be off campus and away from currently enrolled student-athletes.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I-A and I-AA (50-42).

NO. 137 DEAD PERIOD — DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: In Division I football, to permit contact on the National Letter of Intent signing date through the Monday subsequent to the signing date.

Bylaws: Amend 30.9.5, page 399, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]
"30.9.5 Football, Division I. The following contact and evaluation
periods shall apply to football in Division I:

[30.9.5-(a) through 30.9.5-(g) unchanged.]

"(h) During the period 48 hours before and

Dead Period"

A-164 _______1992 Convention Proceedings

72 hours after **prior to** 8 a.m. on the date for signing the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this time; it must be mailed);

[Remainder of 30.9.5 unchanged.]

Source: Clemson University, East Carolina University, Georgia Institute of Technology, Kansas State University, Mississippi State University, University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, Pennsylvania State University, Syracuse University, Texas A&M University, West Virginia University and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: One of the most important times during the entire recruiting process is the actual signing of the National Letter of Intent. It is a time when a member of the institution's coaching staff can discuss the ramifications and importance of executing a letter of intent. To not allow contact by an authorized institutional representative during this period can potentially lead to confusion on the part of the prospect or result in an institution offering an excessive number of initial grants. It also is a concern of high-school football coaches that they will be placed in a position of being required to explain the significance of the National Letter of Intent.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I-A and I-AA.

NO. 138 CONTACTS SUBSEQUENT TO SIGNING THE NATIONAL LETTER OF INTENT

Intent: To specify that Divisions I and II member institutions may contact prospective student-athletes who have signed National Letters of Intent at any time, except in the situations specified.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4.4, page 95, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.1.4.4 Contacts Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing. Subsequent to the calendar day on which the prospect signs a National Letter of Intent, there shall be no limit on the number of contacts with the prospect, the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) by the institution with which the prospect has signed; however, the following conditions continue to apply:

[13.1.4.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) No in-person, on- or off-campus contact may be made during a 'dead period' in the sports;

[13.1.4.4-(c) through 13.1.4.4-(e), relettered as 13.1.4.4-(b) through 13.1.4.4-(d), unchanged.]

"(f) (e) Contact at the site of a prospect's competition shall continue to be governed by the provisions of 13.1.5.2, except that contact with the prospect's relatives or legal guardians at the site of the prospect's competition

Legislative Proposals A	-165
-------------------------	------

shall be permitted."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Contact with prospective student-athletes who have signed a National Letter of Intent should not be limited, except in those situations in which it is clear that such contact may distract the prospect or may create a recruiting advantage with respect to other prospects.

Action: Paragraph (b) was defeated and (f) was adopted by Division I after a successful motion to divide the proposal. Adopted by Division II.

NO. 139 INSTITUTIONAL STATIONERY

Intent: To permit Division I member institutions to utilize two colors of printing on institutional stationery.

Bylaws: Amend 13.4.1, pages 98-99, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Permissible Items. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the following printed materials to prospects and to high-school and two-year college coaches:

[13.4.1-(a) through 13.4.1-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) General correspondence, including letters and regular (not specialized) cards that do not include pictures of the institution's department of athletics personnel or enrolled student athletes. In Division I only, institutional stationery is limited to one two colors of printing on the stationery (not including the color of the typing or writing on such stationery). Such stationery may include athletics department stationery with name, address, telephone number(s) of athletics department staff members and a single university logo, but photographs of enrolled student-athletes or any other promotional material is prohibited;"

[Remainder of 13.4.1 unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the Colonial Athletic Association.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Since most institutions have two "official" colors, this amendment would retain the intent of reduced printing costs, while permitting the normal use of the institution's two colors in printed items covered by this legislation.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

A-166 ________ 1992 Convention Proceedings

NO. 140 DISTRIBUTION OF GRADUATION-RATES REPORT

Intent: To require member institutions to provide to a prospect's guidance office the enrollment and graduation-rate data specified in Bylaw 30.1.

Bylaws: Amend 13.3.1.2, page 98, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.3 1.2 Report Distribution. Member institutions shall provide to prospects, to prospects' parents, to prospects' guidance offices and to prospects' high-school and two-year college coaches the information contained within the report. The information shall be provided upon request and at the earliest opportunity during the recruiting process or upon request; however, in no event shall an institution provide the information later than the day prior to a prospect's signed acceptance of the National Letter of Intent or signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Advisory Committee to Review Implementation of 1990 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 24).

Effective Date: Immediately for Division I; July 1, 1993, for Division II.

Rationale: This proposal makes the distribution of institutional graduation rates more consistent with the requirements of the Student-Athlete Right-to-Know Act. It also clarifies that institutional graduation rates must be provided at the earliest opportunity during the recruiting process or upon request.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 140-1 DISTRIBUTION OF GRADUATION-RATES REPORT

Intent: To specify that prior to the day before a prospect's signed acceptance of the National Letter of Intent or signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid, the graduation-rate data specified in Bylaw 30.1 shall be provided by a member institution to prospects, to prospects' parents, to prospects' guidance offices and to prospects' high-school and two-year college coaches only upon request at the earliest opportunity during the recruiting process.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 140, 13.3.1.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.3.1.2 Report Distribution. Member institutions shall provide to prospects, to prospects' parents, to prospects' guidance offices and to prospects' high-school and two-year college coaches the information contained within the report. The information shall be provided **upon request** at the earliest opportunity during the recruiting process or upon request, however, in no event shall an

_	 A-167
egislative Proposals	

institution provide the information later than the day prior to a prospect's signed acceptance of the National Letter of Intent or signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid."

Source: University of California, Irvine; University of California, Santa Barbara; California State University, Fresno; California State University, Fullerton; University of Hawaii; University of Nevada, Las Vegas; New Mexico State University; University of the Pacific (California); San Jose State University, and Utah State University.

Rationale: This amendment-to-amendment would require a member institution to provide graduation-rate data only when requested to do so prior to signing, as opposed to requiring the institution to provide data to the literally thousands of prospects being recruited. The information still must eventually be provided prior to signing.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 141 RESOLUTION: NCAA-SPONSORED SUMMER BASKETBALL CAMPS

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC) has concluded that basketball camps have become show-places for prospective student-athletes and 'advisors' to parade their basketball talents in a manner that seems inconsistent with and inappropriate for college athletics; and

"Whereas, many college coaches have indicated that the recruitment of basketball prospective student-athletes during the summer months requires coaches to expend funds unnecessarily for the sole purpose of being seen at any of dozens of outside, privately-owned summer basketball camps; and

"Whereas, many outside, private summer camps are selective with regard to which coaches have preferential treatment in observ-

ing a particular prospective student-athlete's abilities; and

"Whereas, the NABC and the NCAA Recruiting Committee have concluded that the coordination, oversight and/or certification of a summer basketball camp program for prospective student-athletes by the NCAA national office would provide member institutions' coaches an opportunity to evaluate prospective student-athletes without the outside pressures associated with independent camps; and

"Whereas, the Women's Basketball Coaches Association (WBCA) also has expressed interest in the development of this concept;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA membership endorses the concept of NCAA-sponsored summer basketball camps; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Association administer a twoyear pilot summer basketball camp program to begin during the summer of 1993, and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that the NCAA Council and Recruiting Committee continue to work with the NABC and the WBCA to develop this project, including the investigation and identification of appropriate funding alternatives."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Action: Adopted as amended by No. 141-1.

NO. 141-1 RESOLUTION: NCAA-SPONSORED SUMMER BASKETBALL CAMPS

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC) has concluded that basketball camps have become show-places for prospective student-athletes, often assisted by 'advisers,' to parade their basketball talents in a manner that seems inconsistent with and inappropriate for college athletics; and

"Whereas, many college coaches have indicated that the recruitment of basketball prospective student-athletes during the summer months requires coaches to expend funds unnecessarily for the sole purpose of being seen at any of dozens of outside, privately owned

summer basketball camps; and

"Whereas, many outside, private summer camps are selective in regard to which coaches have preferential treatment in observing a

particular prospective student-athlete's abilities; and

"Whereas, the NABC and the NCAA Recruiting Committee have concluded that the certification of summer basketball camps for prospective student-athletes by the NCAA national office would help to prevent the continued abuses that currently are ongoing in privately owned summer basketball camps; and

"Whereas, the Women's Basketball Coaches Association (WBCA)

also has expressed interest in the development of this concept;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA membership endorses the concept of NCAA-certified summer basketball camps; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Association develop a program to certify summer basketball camps beginning in the summer of 1993, and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that the NCAA Council and Recruiting Committee continue to work with the NABC and the WBCA to develop this project."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Action: Adopted.

Enforcement

NO. 142 UNETHICAL CONDUCT

Intent: To specify that an individual's failure to appear and furnish information at an infractions hearing when requested to do so by the NCAA Committee on Infractions constitutes unethical conduct.

Legislative Proposals		A-169
-----------------------	--	-------

Bylaws: Amend 10.1, page 45, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"10.1 UNETHICAL CONDUCT

"Unethical conduct by a prospective or enrolled student-athlete or an institutional staff member may include, but is not limited to, the following:

[10.1-(a) through 10.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Failure to appear and furnish information at an infractions hearing when requested to do so by the Committee on Infractions."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Currently, the NCAA has no authority to require attendance at infractions hearings except for representatives of the institution under inquiry or individuals who are accused of wrongdoing and who also are associated with a member institution. This proposal would permit the committee to call additional witnesses when it appears that their participation in the hearing would aid the committee in its consideration of the infractions case.

Action: Defeated (378-209, 18 abstentions), two-thirds majority required for adoption.

NO. 143 DISCIPLINARY MEASURES — TELEVISION COVERAGE

Intent: To prohibit the television coverage of an institution's intercollegiate athletics team on a delayed basis when television sanctions are imposed in that sport on a member institution by the Committee on Infractions.

A. Bylaws: Amend 19.4.2.1, pages 334-335, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"19.4.2.1 Disciplinary Measures. Among the disciplinary measures, singly or in combination, that may be adopted by the committee (or the appropriate division steering committee of the Council on appeal) and imposed against an institution for major violations are:

[19.4.2.1-(a) through 19.4.2.1-(e) unchanged.

"(f) Ineligibility for any television programs involving live coverage of the institution's intercollegiate athletics team or teams in the sport or sports in which the violations occurred:"

[Remainder of 19.4.2.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 19.4.2.5, page 336, as follows:

[General provisions, all divisions, common vote]

"19.4.2.5 Television Appearance Limitations. In some instances,

an institution is rendered ineligible to appear on "we' television programs. When an institution is banned from such television programs, the penalty shall specify that the institution may not enter into any contracts or agreements for such appearances until the institution's probationary status has been terminated and it has been restored to full rights and privileges of member-

[19 4.2.5.1 unchanged.]

"19 4 2 5 2 Live Telecast. For purposes of implementing television sanctions, a telecast shall be considered live coverage unless the telecast is presented at least 30 minutes after the actual beginning of the athletics contest in question and begins no earlier than 10 30 p m at the site of the reception"

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Prohibiting all institutional television appearances in the sports affected for a designated period of time appears to be an appropriate and effective penalty.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 144 DISCIPLINARY MEASURES — BROAD-BASED REVENUE DISTRIBUTION MONIES

Intent: To permit the Committee on Infractions to withhold all or a portion of a member institution's broad-based revenue distribution monies as a penalty in a major infractions case.

Bylaws: Amend 19.4.2.1, pages 334-335, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"19.4.2.1 Disciplinary Measures. Among the disciplinary measures, singly or in combination, that may be adopted by the committee (or the appropriate division steering committee of the Council on appeal) and imposed against an institution for major violations are:

[19.4.2.1-(a) through 19.4.2.1-(j) unchanged.]

"(k) Forfeiture of all or a portion of the institution's share of the broad-based revenue distribution monies for a specified period;"

[Remainder of 19.4.2.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The establishment of this penalty provides the Committee on Infractions with flexibility in its consideration of disciplinary measures in major infractions cases. The committee had similar authority prior to the change in championships revenue distribution.

Action: Adopted.

Legislative Proposals A	A-17
-------------------------	------

Championships

NO. 145 DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS — WOMEN'S FIELD HOCKEY, MEN'S ICE HOCKEY AND MEN'S LACROSSE

Intent: To establish a National Collegiate Division II championship in the sports of women's field hockey, men's ice hockey and men's lacrosse, and to transform the Division III Men's Ice Hockey Committee into the Divisions II and III Men's Ice Hockey Committee to facilitate the administration of the Division II Men's Ice Hockey Championship.

A. Bylaws: Amend 18.2.3 by adding new 18.2.3.1, page 324, as follows.

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"18.2.3.1 Exception for Division II Championships. A National Collegiate Division II Championship may be established in the sports of women's field hockey, men's ice hockey and men's lacrosse without meeting the requirements of 18.2.3-(a) and 18.2.3-(b)."

B. Bylaws: Amend 18.3.3, page 326, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"18.3.3 National Collegiate Division II Championships (20) (23)

"Men (11) (13)

Women (9) (10)

"Ice Hockey

Field Hockey"

"Lacrosse

C. Bylaws: Amend 21.6.20, page 382, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.6.20 Ice Hockey Committee, Divisions II and III Men's. The Divisions II and III Men's Ice Hockey Committee shall consist of two representatives from Division II and four representatives from Division III, including two Division III members from the East, comprising Districts 1, 2 and 3, and two Division III members from the West, comprising Districts 4, 5, 6, 7 and

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1992.

Rationale: Pursuant to the membership's adoption of Proposal No. 57 at the 1991 Convention, the Executive Committee was directed to sponsor this proposal, which will permit the establishment of Division II championships in sports in which Divisions I and III currently have their own championships and Division II does not (i.e., women's field hockey, men's ice hockey and men's lacrosse). The proposal also creates a Divisions II and III Men's Ice Hockey Committee to facilitate the administration of a Divi-

A-172 _______1992 Convention Proceedings

sion II championship in that sport. Division II championships in field hockey and in men's lacrosse will be administered by the existing championships committees in those sports. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$90,000.]

Action: Adopted.

NO. 146 CHAMPIONSHIP CRITERIA — MINIMUM SPONSORSHIP EXEMPTION

Intent: To establish a three-year period during which an existing National Collegiate Championship will not be canceled or its transportation or per diem expenses discontinued due to that championship's failure to meet the minimum percentage sponsorship requirements for maintaining the championship.

Bylaws: Amend 18.2.10 by adding new 18.2.10.2, page 325, as fol-

[General provisions, all divisions, common vote]

"18.2.10.2 National Collegiate Championships Exception. During the 1991-92, 1992-93 and 1993-94 academic years, an existing National Collegiate Championship shall not be canceled, nor shall transportation and per diem expenses be discontinued, due to that championship's failure to meet the minimum percentage or numerical sponsorship requirements for maintaining the championship. Upon the expiration of this legislative exception, any year(s) during the 1991-94 period that a championship fell below the applicable minimum sponsorship percentage set forth in 18.2.3 or 18.2.4 shall count toward the two consecutive-year limitation."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: During the 1991 Convention, the membership adopted a resolution calling for an exception to the minimum sponsorship requirements to permit the establishment of three Division II championships in sports with minimal Division II sponsorship (i.e., women's field hockey, men's ice hockey and men's lacrosse). The National Collegiate Championships in the sports of men's volleyball, men's water polo, men's gymnastics and men's and women's rifle represent the only NCAA championships opportunity in those sports, which have greater sponsorship than the Division II sports mentioned above. The Executive Committee has concluded that it is appropriate to sponsor legislation to permit the continuation of these National Collegiate Championships for a limited time period should the sports fall below minimum sponsorship requirements.

Action: Ado

to the Dominanta	A-173
Legislative Proposals	• • - · -

NO. 147 CHAMPIONSHIP CRITERIA — MINIMUM SPONSORSHIP EXEMPTION

Intent: To confirm that transportation expenses may be provided during the second consecutive year during which a National Collegiate Championship falls below minimum sponsorship percentages, and to specify that a National Collegiate Championship that falls below the 50-institution sponsorship requirement and fails to meet net-receipt requirements shall not be discontinued until the subsequent academic year.

Bylaws: Amend 18.2.11, page 325, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"18.2.11 Exemptions. The following are exempt from the minimum sponsorship percentage requirements of 18.2.3 and 18.2.4 for championship continuation:

[18.2.11-(a) unchanged.]

- "(b) A National Collegiate Championship for which all divisions are eligible and that was established prior to the 1982-83 academic year, provided that at least 50 member institutions sponsor the sport. Transportation expenses for the championship may be provided by the Association during the second consecutive year during which the championship falls below the applicable minimum sponsorship percentage set forth in 18.2.3, but subsequently shall not be provided by the Association in this circumstance., and
- "(c) A National Collegiate Championship that fails to meet the net-receipt requirement specified in 18.2.11-(a) and falls below the 50-institution sponsorship requirement specified in 18.2.11-(b) shall not be discontinued until the academic year subsequent to the year in which it fails to meet the 50-institution requirement."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Inasmuch as the official sport sponsorship figures are based on the Association's records as of September 30 each academic year, this proposal will permit a more realistic time period to implement the termination of transportation expenses and the discontinuation of National Collegiate Championships that fall below minimum sponsorship requirements.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 148 SUNDAY CHAMPIONSHIPS COMPETITION — NOON START TIME

Intent: To permit championship competition to begin prior to noon
on Sunday if the host institution is selected to conduct two

A-174	1992 Convention Proceeding
4-1/4	

NCAA championship contests at the same outdoor facility and darkness is a primary concern.

Bylaws: Amend 31.1.4.4, page 407, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"31.1.4.4 Noon Start Time, NCAA competition conducted on Sunday may not begin prior to noon, local time, except that a waiver may be granted by the applicable sports committee if the host institution is selected to conduct two NCAA championship contests at the same outdoor facility on the same Sunday and darkness is a primary concern."

Source: Eastern Connecticut State University; Framingham State College: Ithaca College: North Adams State College; Plymouth State College; Salem State College; Southeastern Massachusetts University; University of Southern Maine; State University of New York at Stony Brook, and Western Connecticut State University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: In the event that two fall season teams (e.g., men's and women's soccer) from the same institution are selected to host an NCAA regional or national weekend tournament when the format calls for two championship contests to occur on Sunday on the same playing field, this waiver would permit the host institution to start one of the two contests prior to noon, local time. This would eliminate the possibility that the second championship game might be suspended due to darkness. Twice in recent years, Plymouth State College earned the right to host both the NCAA Division III New England men's and women's soccer championships. However, because both teams play on the same field and because of the prohibition against starting a Sunday contest prior to noon, local time, one of Plymouth State's teams had to be sent to another site for the regional tournament. This amendment would provide relief for institutions that have two outstanding teams and are precluded from hosting championship contests on a Sunday due to darkness.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 149 RESOLUTION: DIVISION I CHAMPIONSHIPS ELIGIBILITY

[Division I only]

"Whereas, a fundamental principle of the NCAA, as detailed in its constitution, is to develop its structure and programs and those of its members in a manner that promotes opportunity for equity in competition to assure that individual student-athletes and institutions will not be prevented unfairly from achieving the benefits inherent in participation in intercollegiate athletics; and

"Whereas, a right inherent in institutional membership is the opportunity to participate in an NCAA championship; and

"Whereas, ratings based upon mathematical formulae and data often are not available to governing sports committees in the selec-

Legislative Proposals		A-175
-----------------------	--	-------

tion of various NCAA championships fields and, in sports where such data are available, they often are skewed due to practical scheduling constraints; and

"Whereas, the criteria employed by governing sports committees in selecting participants for NCAA championships competition are

not as equitable or reliable as head-to-head competition; and

"Whereas, member institutions make commitments to sponsor and fund specific sports, and member conferences commit to the administration of competition and championships in specific sports;

"Whereas, champions that meet the eligibility requirements of and NCAA Bylaw 31.2.1 of NCAA Division I conferences often are selected as participants in NCAA championships competition; and

"Whereas, all Division I conference champions in the sport of basketball have been provided an opportunity to compete for a berth in the Division I Men's Basketball Championship based upon head-

to-head competition:

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Executive Committee direct the governing sports committees to address the equity and feasibility of providing all Division I conference champions in each sport the opportunity to participate in NCAA championships competition in that sport by automatic qualification, at-large selection or NCAA-administered prechampionship head-to-head competition, with recommendations to be presented by the governing sports committees to the Executive Committee no later than April 1, 1993 "

Source: All eight members of the Patriot League.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A.

Committees

NO. 150 INTERPRETATIONS COMMITTEE

Intent: To specify that at least one Division I member of the committee shall be an individual with primary responsibilities in the area of compliance at a Division I member institution.

Bylaws: Amend 21.3.14.1, page 374, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote] "21.3.14.1 Composition. The Interpretations Committee shall consist of 10 members, including four from Division I, one of whom shall be an institutional administrator with primary responsibilities for compliance and three each from Divisions II and III. Three positions shall be allocated for men, three allocated for women and four unallocated. At least three members of the committee shall be members of the Council."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Auburn University; University of Florida; University of Georgia; University of Kentucky; Mississippi State University; University of North Texas;

1992 Convention Proceedings A-176 ___

University of South Carolina, Columbia; University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and Vanderbilt University.

Effective Date: Immediately; effective for the next Division I committee vacancy.

Rationale: Inasmuch as institutional compliance coordinators are most directly responsible not only for educating coaches and administrators regarding NCAA legislation but also for developing programs to ensure the proper application of this legislation, it would seem appropriate that an individual with extensive, hands-on expertise regarding legislative implementation at the institutional level should be included on the committee responsible for legislative interpretations. It should be noted that this change would involve no additional cost for the Association.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 151 NCAA STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Intent: To increase from 16 to 28 the number of student-athletes on the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and to permit student-athlete committee members to request that they be reelected for one term, subject to the approval of the committee

Bylaws: Amend 21.3.25, page 376, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21 3.25 Student-Athlete Committee.

"21.3.25.1 Composition. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee shall consist of 19 31 members, including 16 28 student-athletes, eight 12 from Division I, tour eight from Division II and four eight from Division III, and including three members of the Council, one from each division. The composition of the committee shall be exempt from the playingconference restriction set forth in Bylaw 21.1.1.2. The committee shall be constituted as follows:

"(a) Five Nine shall be allocated for male student-athletes. tive nine positions shall be allocated for female studentathletes and six 10 student-athlete positions shall be unallocated:

[Remainder of 21.3.25.1 unchanged.]

"21.3.25.2 Term of Office. A student-athlete member shall not serve more than two years on the committee but may request reappointment for another two-year term, subject to the chair's approval. Student-athletes may serve on the committee up to two years after completion of their intercollegiate athletics eligibility."

[Remainder of 21.3.25 unchanged.]

Legislative Proposals A-17

Source: NCAA Council (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: It is difficult for 16 student-athletes to try to represent the nearly 300,000 student-athletes across the country; further, because of the time demands on student-athletes, the committee has never had a meeting where all 16 members were in attendance (average attendance has been approximately nine student-athletes). Accordingly, the committee believes that expanded membership is both necessary and desirable. In addition, the committee is attempting to develop a student-athlete networking system among member institutions and conferences and needs to be able to identify a representative at each member institution. Expanding the committee's membership and permitting student-athletes to be reappointed to the committee will facilitate that goal. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$18,000.]

Action: Adopted.

NO. 152 COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

Intent: To establish a compliance committee to address various compliance-related issues and initiatives.

Bylaws: Amend 21.3 by adding new 21.3.9, page 373, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.9 Compliance Committee.

"21.3.9.1 Composition. The Compliance Committee shall consist of 12 members, including 10 members from Division I and one member each from Divisions II and III. Three positions shall be allocated for conference administrators with primary responsibilities in the compliance area, three positions shall be allocated for institutional compliance coordinators, one position allocated for an athletics director, one position allocated for a faculty athletics representative and three positions shall be unallocated. At least three committee members shall be men and at least three shall be women. Committee membership also shall include at least one member of the NCAA Council.

"21.3.9.2 Duties. The committee shall study and make policy recommendations to the NCAA Council, appropriate NCAA committees and the NCAA compliance services department concerning various compliance related issues and initiatives at the institutional, conference and national levels."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Auburn University; University of Florida; University of Georgia; University of Kentucky; Mississippi State University; University of North Texas;

University of South Carolina, Columbia; University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and Vanderbilt University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Given the Association's increasing emphasis on compliance-related matters such as rules education, institutional control, coaches certification and institutional certification, it is appropriate to establish a committee to review such compliance initiatives and to serve as a direct resource for the NCAA compliance services department. Although the creation of this committee would result in additional cost for the Association, enhancing input opportunities for those individuals most directly responsible for implementing compliance initiatives should result in more thorough and effective planning efforts at the national level, which should lead to the implementation of more cost-effective and appropriate compliance programs at the institutional and conference levels. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$18,000.]

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 152-1 COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

Intent: To change the composition of the Compliance Committee from three conference administrators, three institutional compliance coordinators, one athletics director, one faculty athletics representative and three unallocated positions to four athletics directors, four faculty athletics representatives, one conference commissioner and three unallocated positions.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 152, 21.3.9.1, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.9.1 Composition. The Compliance Committee shall consist of 12 members, including 10 members from Division I and one member each from Divisions II and III. Three One positions shall be allocated for a conference administrators commissioner with primary responsibilities in the compliance area, three positions shall be allocated for institutional compliance coordinators, one four positions allocated for an athletics directors, one four positions allocated for a faculty athletics representatives and three positions shall be unallocated. At least three committee members shall be men and at least three shall be women. Committee membership also shall include at least one member of the NCAA Council."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Rationale: Below the level of the chief executive officer, institutional control should be achieved on campuses through a system of shared responsibility between the faculty athletics representative and the director of athletics. Both report to the president or chancellor and are accountable for ensuring that institutional control is achieved.

	*** . 1
Action:	Withdrawn

Legislative Proposals	A-179
-----------------------	-------

NO. 152-2 COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

Intent: To revise the composition of the proposed NCAA Compliance Committee as indicated.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 152, 21.3.9.1, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote] "21.3.9.1 Composition. The Compliance Committee shall consist of 12 members, including 10 eight members from Division I and one two members each from Divisions II and III. Three Two positions shall be allocated for conference administrators with primary responsibilities in the compliance area, three two positions shall be allocated for institutional compliance coordinators, one two positions allocated for an athletics directors, one two positions allocated for a faculty athletics representatives and three four positions shall be unallocated. At least three committee members shall be men and at least three shall be women. Committee membership also shall include at least one member of the NCAA Council."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Auburn University; University of Florida; University of Georgia; University of Kentucky; Mississippi State University; University of South Carolina, Columbia; University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and Vanderbilt University.

Rationale: Broadening both divisional and administrative representation on the committee should enable it to address a wide array of compliance issues more effectively.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 153 WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL RULES COMMITTEE

Intent: To establish a Women's Volleyball Rules Committee.

Bylaws: Amend 21.4 by adding new 21.4.8, page 378, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.4.8 Volleyball Rules Committee, Women's. The Women's Volleyball Rules Committee shall consist of nine members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(a) Two members shall be from each of the four volleyball regions:

- "(b) Four members shall be from Division I, two members shall be from Division II and two members from Division III, and an additional member shall be secretary. rules editor, and
- "(c) One member shall be elected chair."

Source: All nine members of the Big Sky Conference and all 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current rules-making body, the National Association

1992 Convention Proceedings A-180 ----

for Girls and Women in Sport (NAGWS), is responsible for the development of playing rules for all levels of girls' and women's volleyball. In the recent past, NCAA members have become frustrated with the lack of responsiveness to the needs of the college women's game. A rules-making body would allow NCAA member institutions to use rules developed specifically to meet those needs. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$13,500.]

Action: Defeated.

NO. 154 RESOLUTION: FEDERALLY MANDATED DISCLOSURE OF ATHLETICALLY RELATED REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the Federal higher education reauthorization bill reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor in October 1991 contains a provision requiring that institutions awarding athletically related financial aid obtain annually an independent audit of and make publicly available the revenues and expenditures of their intercollegiate athletics programs on a sport-by-sport basis; and

"Whereas, pursuant to prior Congressional request, the U.S. Department of Education studied the feasibility and desirability of requiring that such data be compiled; in September 1990, the Secretary of Education delivered the department's report to the Congress and, after noting the 'very weak' link between Federal student-aid dollars and intercollegiate athletics, stated his conclusion that it is not advisable for Congress to require institutions to report information on revenues and expenditures for intercollegiate athletics and

athletics departments'; and

"Whereas, NCAA representatives have opposed the proposal on the grounds that the annual compilation of such data, particularly on a sport-by-sport basis, would involve significant time and expense for Divisions I and II institutions; that because of different accounting methods at various member institutions, the inevitable public comparisons of per-sport revenues and expenditures among institutions would necessarily be highly misleading; and that in light of extensive aggregate institutional data already available through NCAA auspices, any benefit to be derived by the proposed reporting requirement is far outweighed by the burden it would impose on institutions; and

"Whereas, it has been suggested by some Congressional representatives that many NCAA members are indifferent to this reporting proposal and that, therefore, the NCAA is not accurately reflecting the views of the membership in its testimony to Congress;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that members of the NCAA hereby record their opposition to the proposal, now under consideration by the House of Representatives, to require institutions awarding athletically related aid to obtain annually an independent audit of and make publicly available the per-sport revenues and expenditures of their atheltics departments and intercollegiate athletics pro-

egislative Proposals	egislative Proposals		4- 183
----------------------	----------------------	--	---------------

"Be It Further Resolved, that the NCAA Council is instructed to take all steps necessary to communicate to Congress the opposition of the NCAA membership to this proposed Federal legislation."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Adopted (561-154, 37 abstentions).

1992 Convention Proceedings A-182 _

Roll-Call Voting

This is a summary of the 40 roll-call votes that were conducted at the 1992 NCAA Convention in Anaheim.

Each column represents a roll-call vote at the Convention. The number at the head of each column is the proposal number. In instances where the vote involved only member institutions in one division, that division also is indicated.

Where letters are indicated, the reference is to parts of multipart proposals included in that vote.

Other codes in the headings are as follows: MTR refers to a motion to refer; VTR refers to a vote to reconsider, and VTS refers to a vote to separate items in the proposal.

	14	16	16 18-1	16 1	g 20-1	25 21	I-A 21-	1 21-8	24 25	1 25		3	26	30 I	4 19 : A	20-1 2 	20 21-A II II	29 3	10 34 II Viii	-		48 CD V	18		31 33- AE	A	8		AO	B 154	
MEMBER MAME ARICHAE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY ADAMS STATE COLLEGE ADELPH UNIVERSITY ARRIAN COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON ARAMA BAM HINDERSITY	v. 'Ì	MŤŘ			 	ا من بيد	ا , .					7 E	<u>.</u> _	- Ye	S Yes	Yes Ye	s No	Yes - N	o Yes	Yes Ye	s	Ė	₹ `	₽ <u>_</u> -		· · ·	``	Yes .	Yes Y	s Yes	Yes
ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY		 				- <u> </u>	ΞĢI	<i>3</i> —		= /=			·,=;-:	–∵Ye	yes	No & N	o No	No N	o Yes	Yes N	٠ <u>٠</u>	; :	<u> </u>	·		4	^ = 181 % = -	- No	Yes Ye	s - Abs	Yes
ADAMS STATE COLLEGE ADELPHI UNIVERSITY	ii. Sa m. Sa	72°,		$\mathbb{Z}[\tilde{\mathcal{T}}]$		ž	3	:		Va.	Lynn Apr Ar		. No.: N	0 -			-:	. 	- fn =	Ye	s.".—			_` <u>`</u>	<u> </u>			Yes	No ŽY	s Yes	Yes
ADRIAN COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON	A: Yes	No "Y	es aves	Yes (Ye	:s , Yes 	_Yes_\	(65 _ TE	 2 7 4 6 2	,NU 1.1		عقبيدجيريية بي و :		No N	— Ye ∛o –	s Yes	Yes Ye	s No	No N	0 No	No N	o	_	= =	_	= =	=	_ :	– No – Yes	No Y	es No	Yes
ADRIAN COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON ALABAMA ABM UNIVERSITY ALABAMA STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA-TISCALOOSA UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA-BIRMINGHAM LAL UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA-HUNTSVILLE	A Yes	Yes I	No Yes	No Ye	s No	No No	— N Yes Ye	lo No es Yes	No Y	es ye es ye	\$ \$,	-	Yes Y	85 – 85 –	=	_ =	= =	_ :	=	Ye	s	_	= =	_	= =	=	_ :	– Yes – Yes	Yes Y	re — es yes	Yes —
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA TUSCALOOSA	A Yes	No Y	es Yes	Yes Ye	5 Yes	Yes	Ves A	lo Yes	No Y	es ye	s 	J		 - v	· Vac.	Vec Ye		Yes Ye	· · ·	No Ye		, <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>				Yes	Yes Y	S Yes	Yesi
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA HUNTSVILLE	1				بر من من بر	5Ç = 0	 -				ي روز الاستان وي مواد كوران الاستان وي	33 (30) 30 (3)	<u> </u>	- Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Ab	s - No	Yes Ye	š]	<u>,_</u>	_*:±	<u> </u>		·	- 10 ـــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	Yes	Abs Y	s Yes	Yes Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS	11 -		艺生	— 1	<u>-</u> ンァ	. . .,	7:			<u> </u>	- to 100	A.	· = :		; <u>,</u> =		-:		- ×	= . =	Yes	≓ No`:	No - No	Yes	No Ye	: - <u>-</u> -	No Y	s Yes	Yes Y	s √Yes	- = [
STATE LINIV OF NEW YORK-ALBANY	加金金	: - }	<u> </u>	` `:		. ≘	ُ نے	<u> </u>	=	÷.		. سخست									- Yes	No	No -	Yes	No No	No.	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Y	s Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA TUSCALOOSA UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA SIRAINGHAM I-AUNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA-BURNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FARBANKS ALBARY STATE COLLEGE (GA.) STATE UNIV OF REW YORK-ALBANY ALBERTUS MAGNUS COLLEGE ALBION COLLEGE ALBION COLLEGE ALBOR STATE UNIVERSITY ALFRED UNIVERSITY ALFRED UNIVERSITY ALFRED UNIVERSITY ALEGHENY COLLEGE ALLEGHENY COLLEGE ALLEGHENY COLLEGE ALLEGHENY COLLEGE	# -	_					_		_	- ·		,4	Yes Y		=	= =	= =	= =	= =	Ye	5 -	Ξ.			Yes Yes				Yes Ye	s No	
ALBRIGHT COLLEGE. ALCORN STATE UNIVERSITY	AÄ Yes	Yes	No No	No Y	es Ye	s No	_	No Yes	NO.	NO 11	-			 	·		 			<u>-</u>	- NO - Yes	No_)	es_Yes	Yes.	No Yes	NO NO	No Ye	5 Yes_	Yes Y	5 Y65	Yes
ALEGHENY COLLEGE	<u> </u>				=_=		-	= =	. <u>.</u> _	<u> </u>		1	Ξ.	_` =	, <u> </u>	Ξ_{i}^{-}	<u> </u>	(=)1=		\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z}	Yes	No's	No No	Yes	No No	- No	Yes ?Ye	s Yes	Yes . Ye	s Yes	Yes
ALFRED UNIVERSITY ALLEGHENY COLLEGE ALLENTOWN COLLEGE ALMA COLLEGE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY I-		(°;- '	-4-					_ ~ _	=	-*; 			_	Ye	Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes N	o No	Yes Ye	s,	Ξ.″		· Ξ.	:	`_'	بر تار	- Yes - Yes	No Y	s Yes	Yes
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO	11 37	\j	4F	Van de	ine Ve	_≺√≝ is Yes	. <u>~~</u>	in in	Yes	Yes Y	= ```\^`````````````````````````````````	المنتانة الإ	Yes. Ye	5			=:4=	: L		- N	0 <u>*</u> — - Ves	Vec V	es No	Yes	Yes No	YAS	No N	Abs . In Yes	No	yes. S Nn	Yes
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY	aaa yee — III —	s∠N0% - —					_	_` =	=	=	_	1	_ :	– Ye:	s Yes '	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye	s -	_			= =	=	= =	- Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes
AMBELO STATE UNIVERSITY	II -	: =					_ 	 Yes No	- — n No	Yes 1	_ (es	.]	No N	lo —	-	_ :				Ye	s -	-		_		_	_ :	- Yes - Yes	No Yes	s No	No Yes
APPALACHAN TANIFERSITY	-AA Ye I-A Ye	s Yes s No	No Yes	S NO	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes	No Ye	s Yes.	Yes	165 Vec	- E.	NO YE	o." –	=:		-\ _'	_77	-35-	—` Ye	s —	y — T		()	<u> </u>	,= <u>;</u>	×	Yes	No ∴ Ye	S Yes	Yes
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PULL BIBLY AMERICAN UNIVERSITY AMERICAN UNIVERSITY AMERICAN UNIVERSITY AMHERST COLLEGE ANGELO STATE UNIVERSITY ANNA MARIA COLLEGE APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS-FAYETTEVILLE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS-ITTLE ROCK ARMSTROMG STATE COLLEGE ASBURY COLLEGE ASBURY COLLEGE ASBURY COLLEGE ASBURY COLLEGE ASSILATE ONLEGE ASSILATE OUNIVERSITY ASSILATED UNIVERSITY	ÇA"Ye	s∛ No s∵No	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Y Yes Y	es Yes	Yes.	Yes Ye	s No	Yes :	Yes		Yes - Ye	10 — 35 —	∵Ę;	2:1	· ·	Ξ::Ξ	= =.	_ Ye	s . — .	Ξ.,		温.	No Yes	: - ;	红额	Yes	Yes Ye	S 165	Yes
ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS FAYETTEVILLE	IA Ye	s No	Yes Ye	s-Yes, s-No.	Yes Yes . Y	— Yes es Yes	yes. Yes	Yes Ye	s No	Yes	Yes	1 to 1		- * Ye	Yes	Yes Ye	s: Yes	Yes Ye	s ~ No :	Yes Y	s =	-	- -	- = :		, <u> </u>	:=:	- Yes	No Ye	s¹ Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS-LITTLE ROCK ARMSTRONG STATE COLLEGE		÷: <u> </u>		- 2 1	. . ?		·- -	AT -		Ξ.		7	= :	- Yes	Yes	Yes Ye	s No	Yes N	o No	No N	0 ~	_		_	_ =	_	_ =	– Yes – Yes	No Ye	s Yes	No
ASBURY COLLEGE ASHI AND UNIVERSITY	11 -		= :		_		_				-	,	No At	– Yes	Yes '	Yes Ye	s No		0 No	Yes Ye	s s	_	= =	_		=	= =	– Yes – Yes	Yes Ye	s No is Yes	Yes
ASSUMPTION COLLEGE ATI ANTIC 10 CONFERENCE	-AAA Y	es Abs	Abs Yes	s Abs	Yes Y	ies Yes ies Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	S ADS	Yes	Yes	1-72-	Yes Yes		,: <u>=</u> -	35	<u></u> .		-5:	— Ye ≟ Ye	s .— s ``;	Ξ,	I I	; <u> </u>		: <u> </u>		Yes ?	Yes . Ye	s Yes	Yes
ATLANTIC COAST CONFERENCE	- I-AY	es No	Yes Y	s Yes,	Yes	res Yes	Yes	Yes Y	es No	Yes	Yes i	4		- Yeś	Yes	No N	o No	Yes Ye	s No *	No N	· ** — ·	_,	<u> </u>	, -	No. No	ા* ≜ જ –ે		_ ' _: Yes	· — ∛⊹ _ No _≈ Ye	_ ` `~_ ` 5 ` Y63 :	Yes
AUGSBURG COLLEGE			;		·= 4		Ξ.	: <u> </u>	- (<u> </u>	γΞ.			<u>i</u> do	-:'^Nc	· Yes 1	· YesYe	s : No	No .N	^ ∴No∂±	No ~ N	- , No = (o'.:=-::	No 1	No No	Yes	No; ANd	, No	- No ≤ Ye	s Yes - No	Yes € Ye No i≤ Ye	s No.	Yes
AUGUSTANA COLLEGE (IL)		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	- 1	_::-		<u>.</u> _ [.		`=		7	No Ye		_				_		- 165	NU T	es no	162	No No	NU	162 16	S : ES	163 16	is res	165
AURORA UNIVERSITY	III I-AA Y	es No	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes	Yes	즼			_	_ =															
AVERETY COLLEGE	111 131	= =	_		_	= =	_	= :		. <u>-</u>	_	,				~~~~			٠, و حيو			- 43	- Yes	Yes	No Yes No Yes No Yes Yes Yes	No	No Ye	s —	Ye	s —	100
BALOWIN WALLACE COLLEGE	Lil I-A. \	es No	Yes. \	es Yes	Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	No Y	ies , No	, Yes	Yes 🔥 🚜 .				τΞ:				;		: -:	,=,:	Ξ,Ξ	=. ₇	=	. <u>.</u>		10-16	Mary Vo	S 7 165	- Ves
BALL STATE UNIVERSITY BARD COLLEGE	: W .	3 3	<u></u>	三洋学	Ξ_{i}	rEivi	<u> </u>	·= ,		·	$-\langle \gamma \rangle \partial x$			TES	TES :	;-	S NB	es n	: <u> </u>	NO 16	'Yes'	Yes Y	es No	Yes-	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye	S Yes	Yes
BARRY UNIVERSITY BATES COLLEGE	- (1-A	 Yes. No	Yes.	≏ — res∴Yes	Yes .	Yes Ye	s. Yes	Yes 1	Yes : Ye	s Yes	Yes	-	. res n	- Yes	Yes	res Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye												s Yes	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ARRANDAS-LITTLE BOOK ARMSTRONG STATE COLLEGE ASBURY COLLEGE ASHLAND UNIVERSITY ASSUMPTION COLLEGE ATLANTIC TO CONFERENCE ATLANTIC COAST CONFERENCE ALUBURN UNIVERSITY AUSSBURG COLLEGE AUGUSTANA COLLEGE (LL) AUGUSTANA COLLEGE (SL) BALGONTANA COLLEGE (SL) BALGONTANA COLLEGE (SL) BALGONTANA COLLEGE BASSON COLLEGE BALGONTANA MALLACE COLLEGE BALGONTANALACE COLLEGE BARTY ONLYERSITY BAFES COLLEGE BAYLOR UNIVERSITY BAFES COLLEGE BAYLOR UNIVERSITY BELARMINE COLLEGE	. !!			_ =	=	_ =		_	_ =	=	Ξ	1						- N	No	No No	=	= :	= =	_	No Yes			- No	No -	- Yes	Yes
BELUIT COLLEGE	11		_		=	_ :		_			-	3	_ :	- Yes	Yes Y	es Ye	s Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	No No	- No	No !	Wo Yes	No —	No Yes	Yes —	Yes Ye	s — - No	Yes Ye	s No	Yes
BEMIOJI STATE UNIVERSITY BENNETT COLLEGE BENTLEY COLLEGE	. II	= =			_			-			-	4																			
									D		lines		Roll-	Cali	l Votii	ng _														_ A -3	185
					199	2 Co	nvei	ution	rro	ceea	uigs	3																			

	MEMBER NAME	Bhv.	14 L 8	16 WTR	18 18-	1 18	ים ו	20 -1 1	29 21-4 	21-1	21-8	24 25	1 25 MTR			28	30 	14 N	19 20- II II	20 	21-A U	29	80 34 N VTN		28 #2-1 A	32 ABCD	31 31 VTS	⊪1 3 1-4	-2 31 AE	33-1		33 33 B C	28 8	34 A0	36 15	4 35
1	BERIEA COLLEGE BERNARD M. BARUCH COLLEGE BETHANY COLLEGE (W.VA.) BETHEL COLLEGE (MINN.)	111 111 111 111	, I ,	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		=		= = = : = :,;=	=======================================				, 1				= .	_ · -		<u>-</u> .	`_`. 	- -	. <u></u> - <u></u>	— Yes — 'No — Yes Yes	Yes No	Yes I	No Ye No Ab No No No Ab	s No.	Yes 1	Yes Ye No N	No No les Yes No Yes No Yes	Yes "	Yes Yes Yes	Yes : N	Vo Yes Yes Vo Yes es Yes
i	BIG EAST CONFERENCE BIG EIGHT CONFERENCE BIG SKY CONFERENCE	J-A I-A I-AA	Yes Yes Yes	Yes -	No No Yes /es Abs /es Yes /es Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	— Yes Yes	io Yes io Yes es Yes es Yes es Yes	Yes Yes No	Yes Yes	Yes Ye				No No Abs No	Yes Abs No	- - - -		-			- -	Y	bs — es — es —			 	: =	= = =		 	Yes Abs Yes Yes Yes	No	Yes Yes Yes	No - es Yes es Yes es Yes es Yes
	BIG TEN CONFERENCE BIG WEST CONFERENCE STATE UNIV. OF N Y BINGHAMTON H ACKRIBN COLLEGE	IA IA III		No Y	res Yes	s Yes s Yes	Vec .	Yes Y	es Yes es Yes	. Na		Yes Ye No Ye		94 2 (3) 2 (4)		Yes No		 - - Vac \				- :	 	— ·Ý	es es Yes	 No 	No Ye	es Yes	s No		No N	lo Abs	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Abs Yes	Yes Yes N Yes N	es Yes lo Yes lo Yes
	BLOOMSBURG UNIVERSITY OF PA BLUFFTON COLLEGE BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY BOSTON COLLEGE	II III I-AA I-AA	Yes	Yes !	No Yes	s Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Y Yes Y	es Yes	s Yes	Yes		s Yes			No No No	No Yes No	- - -					 	- Y	:s :s :s			 		, 1 + 1 J			Yes Yes No Yes	No Yes	Yes N Yes Ye	es Yes lo Yes es Yes os Yes
	BOWDON COLLEGE BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY	III	Yes	_		s. Yes	Yes	Yes Y	es Ye		Yes Yes	No 'Ye		Ţ.	19 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	No No	No No	Ño Y	es Yes	No	No .	No N	o No	- Y	- Yes	Yes	<u>.</u>	- <u>-</u>		<u> </u>	es Ye		Yes Yes	Abs \	/es_Ye /es ∻Ye /es_Ye	S Yes
	BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF BRIDGEPORT	`.' -A		<u> </u>	Yes Ye	s Yes	- Yes	Yes \		 s No	- Yes	 Tes	- ÷	- -	*	~=- No	 No	<u></u>	- <u>\</u> -	- = . - - -		_;`;`;	;	- Ye	Yes No	Yes No	No Ye Yes Ye	s No	No Yes	Yes Y	es No No Yes	s Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Y Yes Y No Y	es Ye es Ye es Ye	s Yes s Yes s Yes
	named the separate	LAA	Yes	No Y	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes.	Yes.	Yes Ye	s Yes	No —	Yes Y	es Yes	17.55 17.45 17.45		Yes	_	Yes Y	S Yes		Yes	es N		Yes 'Ye	s	====		<u>-</u>				- <u>-</u>	Yes : Yes :	Yes Y No Y	es Yes	O Yes Sayes Sayes
	BHOWN UNIVERSITY BRYANT COLLEGE BRYN MAWR COLLEGE BUCKNELL INIV FOR ITY BUENA WISTA COLLEGE STATE UNIV OF N Y BUFFALO STATE UNIV COLLEGE AT BUFFALO	ייייייי	1 103	_	Yes Ye	lo Yes	Yes	No '	Yes Ye	s No	Yes	-	es Yes		р	. .	Yes Yes Yes		- - - - -	, <u>=</u> '. = =	=======================================	=: = = = =	. /' ; : :	- Ye - Ye - Ye	s — ; No s — - Yes	No :	No. No.	o No - ~	i≾No∠ —	No. Yes	es No Vo No	s Yes o_No o Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Y Yes Y Yes Y Yes Y	es Yes es Yes es No es Yes	S Yes S Yes O Yes S Yes
	SIATE UNIV COLLEGE AT BUFFALO CABRINI COLLEGE CALIFORNIA COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSN UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-DAYIS	1-AA/ -A	Yes	No	Yes Y	es Abs	Yes	Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yas	No Y	es Ye			No		res res ye			:	es No		Yes N - Yes Yes	- - - -	<u>-</u>		 	- -	<u> </u>		: <u>=</u> (2	No Yes Yes	No Yi Yes Yi Yes Yi	es Yes	Yes Yes
	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-RUS ANALES. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-RIVERSIDE. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-SAN DEGO.	-A - -	Yes	. — . No	Yes V	No Yes	Yes	· · ·	= :	es Yes — — es No	Yes Yes	No Y	es Ye es N	. <u> </u>		Yes		/es Ye	s Yes		No Y	as 'Yes	Yes	Yes N	- No.	-	No No				lo Abs	- - - -	Yes No Yes Yes	Yes Yi Yes Yi Yes Yi Yes Yi	es Yes es Yes es Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes
	University of California-Santa Bandana University of California-Santa Cruz University of California-Santa California Institute of Technology California Lutheran University California Poly State Univ. Sld. California State Univ. Bakersfield.	- 1	A Yes	No	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes	Yes — — —	Yes Y	es No 	Yes —	Yes \	/es Ye	s 	_	No	Yes — — Y	es Ye		Yes Yes	Yes Y	es No		Yes No	Yes No	Yes .	No No	_	Yes	— – No Ye	s Yes	Yes Abs	Yes \ Yes \ Yes \ Yes \	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	s Yes	Yes Yes Yes
	CALIFORNIA STATE POLY UNIV -POMONA CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV -BAKERSFIELD CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV -CHICO CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV -CHICO CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV -FRESNO CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV -FRESNO	. '	 Yes		Yes	es Yes	Yes	Yes		No Yes			Yes Ye			, No	— Y	es Ye	s Yes Yes	No Yas	No 1	lo	No No	Yes, Abs No No — No Yes No — Yes	} } ! !	<u></u> 	=		1171			<u> </u>	·No N	Yes Ye — Ye No Ye No Ye No Ye	s Yes s Yes s Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes
	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV-FULLERTON CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV-LONG BEACH CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV-LONG BEACH CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV-LOS ANGELES	- - - -	Yes I — Yes II —	No No	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes i	No Yes	Yes	Yes '	Yes Ye	0 S S		No.	No -	es Ne	-	-	No No	lo No	_	- Yes Yes Yes - Yes Yes No - Yes	=		 	-		 	: _ : _ : _ - -, _	= ;	Yes Yes A Yes A Yes Y	Yes Ye No Ye Yes Ye No Ye	s Yes s Yes s No s Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes
	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV. SACRAMENTO CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV. SAN BERNARDINO. CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV. STANISLAUS CALIFORNIA UNIVERSITY OF PA	I-AA	A Yes	, No		es Ye	Yes			es Yes			No Y	15 27 1 3 - 1 2 3 - 2 2 3		No -1	_ `-	ES Yes		— . Yes	No Ye	s Yes	Yes	— Yes	<u>.</u>	 						- '	Yes N Yes Y	No Ye No Ye Yes Ye Yes Ye	s Yes s Yes s —	Yes Yes Yes
	CALVIN COLLEGE CAMPEGL UNIVERSITY CAMPEGL UNIVERSITY CANISIUS COLLEGE	ا ۱-۵۸ ۱-۵۸	II — II — IA Yes IA Yes	 s No s No	Yes \	Yes Yes	yes s Yes		Yes Yes	- Yes			Yes Y	_ !s !s			No -	s Yes	Yes		No N		<u>-</u>	Yes No Yes No	Yes	No Ye	es No es Yes	Yes	No Y	No No	. — — No	— \ — \ Yes	Yes You Yes N No You Yo	es Yes es Yes lo Yes es Yes	s Yes s No s Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes
	CAPITAL INVERSITY CARLETON COLLEGE CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY CARROLL COLLEGE (MIS) CARROLL COLLEGE (MIS)		Ä -				-	;	= :=;		= =	11111				<u> </u>			. = :	Ξ. : Ξ. : Ξ.,.:					Ma '	res N	es No lo No es No	Yes	No Ye	es No No No io No	i tes		res m Yes Yı	es Yes es Yes es Abs	s yes s yes	Yes Yes Yes
	104		, ,	.,	- -		19	92 (Com	enti	on F	roce	edir	ıgs		Roll	-Cai	II Vo	ting								~ ,.			~ 4 -	resty' eu	ur mile	, . - Tan a	_ سلفية	A -	187

Dis	14 v. t N	15 16 TR	18-1	18 1 9	20-1	20 21-A 	21-1 21-6	3 24 1	5-1 25 MTA	3		26 3	\$0 14 I II	19: 25-1 II II	20 21- II I	A 29	30 3 11 VT	54 64 R	28 #2-1 A	ABCD VI	31 31-1 TS	31-2	31 33-1 -E	33 3 A I	3 33 5 C	28 34 8 AH	1 35 I	154 35
MENBER NAME	,,		<u>.</u>	-712	1 ,		~ <u>~</u> -	1			برخيشة			· - -		-· -		_ · `		No No	No Yes	Yes !	No No es Yes		lo Yes lo Yes			Yes Yes Yes Yes
CARTHAGE COLLEGE CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY		14. H	·= '\'	- * - :]	ΞΞ	Ξį	717		P		_ ~	: - -			=- :	- <i>-</i>	— Yes	No	No Yes No No	Yes.	No No	No. N	lo Yes	`-		No - —í
CASTLETON STATE COLLEGE CATAWBA COLLEGE	1 3 - 3	T,E				ਙ`ਣ		<u>-</u>	<u>-</u> -	والمستندر			- Yes	Yes Yes	No A	No Yes	No 1	lo	Yes` — — Yes	·• — ·	Yes - No		 No Yes		ı́′ İoYes.	Yes N		Yes Yes No Yes
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY	₩ 5	ر— م رس د سست	;					· '		,		_ :					_	- -		-						Yes Y		Yes Yes
CEDAR CREST COLLEGE	AA Yes	No Yes	Yes Y	ಚಿತ Yಚಿತ 	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes Yes	s No	Yes 183		1	No I	- oF	_ <u>-</u> _	_ :		_ :		- No	No	No No	Yes I	No No	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes Y	s Yes	Yes Yes No Yes
CENTRAL COLLEGE (IOWA)	III — AA Yes	No Yes		No Yes	Yes Y	es No No Yes	Yes Yes		Yes No Yes Yes]		√0 √0	= =	_ :	= =	_ :	Yes		-		_	 -,-			Yes Y _Yes ⊾N	oYes_	Yes Yes
INDVERSITY OF CENTRAL PLUNIDA.	A Yes	_No _Yes _a	Yes, Y	es Yes		_ '	32 1		·- ·*	A 4	90 P.	<u> </u>	' No	Yes Yes	Yes 1	No No	ا ۱۸۵۰ر	No No			÷ .÷	٠ بـــــر		(7)	=	Yes N		Yes Yes: Yes Yes
CENTRAL INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSN: CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY	-A`Yes	No Yes	Yes . Y	es Yes	Yes , Y	es : Yes	No Ye	s : Yes	Yes Yes	1	ţ		Yo Yes	Yes Yes				No Yes	Yes Yes	`.⊑	Ξ =		= =		_;=	Yes N	o Yes:⊹	Yes Yes Yes Yes;
CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY	11.	7,12	_; '	<u> </u>	:-· ,	<u>-</u> *-			I::7			7.	_ No	Yes Yes	No . h	No No	No	— Yes	Yes · — — Yes	No	No No	Yes	No - No	No M	lo Yes			No Yes
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL OKLAHOMA CENTRE COLLEGE	.Al.,,.	~~~·					^			. :	4	-	– No	Yes Yes	No N	No Yes		— Yes es No	Yes —	-		-		- :	- -	Yes N		Yes Yes Yes Yes
CHADRON STATE COLLEGE	į –		-		_	= =	_ = =	= =			1	-	- Yes - Yes			No No No Yes	Yes Y No	es No — No	Yes — No —	=		=		= :		No N	o Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes
CHAPMAN COLLEGE	AA Yes	No Yes	No	Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes		Yes Yes		1		No	= =	_ :			- , -	No -	_		Ξ.	.		- ,,,=.	No Y	es Yes.	Yes Yes
COLLEGE OF CHARLESIUN	AA Yes 11 —		_						No Ye		2 7		— No	Yes Yes	"Yes / N	No No	: Yes	Yes	No -		<u> </u>	7	5.5	,	- -, -			Yes No Yes Yes
CHEYNET UNIVERSITY	AA Yes	· No	Yes :	Yes , Yes		No Yes	Yes	es 'No 		-15. F. A	1	No Y	es	., = =	; -	_ '_		-	Yes		Yes Yes		No Yes	No J	No 🖫 No		es Yes	Abs Yes
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO	C 111 . 7 . 0				Yes	 Yes Yes	 sîYesîY	es Yes	Yes ·Ye	5 . s	1	No Y	 es	<u>.</u>				_, _	Yes -	=		;	Ξ Ξ		,	_YesY	es: Yes i	Yes Yes
UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNAIL,	I-A YES	No Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	s Yes	Yes Yes	s Yes	— Na	Yes 1	lo .		Yes	No				_		Yes	. — No	No Yes	- Vec	— — No Yes	No i	 No No	Yes N		No Yes Yes Yes
THE CITADEL CITY UNIV OF NEW YORK ATHLETIC CONF			_			_ =	= -		-	- '	3	_		: <u>=</u> =		= =	= :		— Ye	: No	No No	Yes	No Yes	No f	vo Yes	-		Yes Yes
CLAREMONT-MUDO-SCRIPPS COLLEGES CLARION UNIVERSITY OF PA	ij -					= =	- <u>-</u>	<u> </u>			1	_	— Yes — Yes	s Yes Yes s.YesYes	Yes P	No Yes Yes Yes	Yes .	— Yes No_ No	Yes	. .	= =			. T.,	 	Van N	o Ver	No Vec
CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY	_"								<u>.</u>	- 1 × 4	30	-	<u>-</u> / -	·		i.	Ž _ `	Ξ¥Ξ.	No	No '	Yes No Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No No No Yes	No 1	vo-Yes vo⊥ —	Yes Y — - Y	es Yes es Yes:	Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes
CLARK UNIVERSITY CLARKSON UNIVERSITY CLARKSON UNIVERSITY	"alli — ≀I-A⊃Yes	No Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	No. Ye		No No	Yes (٧٥ ١٠٠٠	100		es — No —	- I - I	, - -	- : -:	3, 7	;	Yes		<u> </u>	<u>-</u>	No Yes		<u> </u>	Yes N Yes Y	o Yes	No Yes Yes Yes
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY	AAA Yes	No Ye	s Yes s Yes	Yes Ye Yes Ye	±s., Yes ⊭s. Yes	Yes N Yes, Ye		es - Yes es - Yes		مبثأنيت وه	-	· No!	No – No –				£=	:	Yes —			<u>`</u> ;≅;	፲ '_			_Yes _Y	es à Yes	Yes Yes
COASTAL CAROLINA COLLEGE	100 - 111 - 111	. <u> </u>							_	_ `	`}	-			- :		_			_		_				_		
COE COLLEGE COLBY COLLEGE	15 -	: = =	= =					Yes Yes	Vec 1			Abs Y			_		_		- No	No '	Yes No		No Yes		Vo Yes	Yes Y	es Yes lo Yes	No Yes Yes Yes
COLBY-SAWYER COLLEGE	I-AÄ —	No Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Yo	es Yes	= =	=_		J	ADS T	es			-			N	No.	Yes No	_Yes _	No No	No .	No, Yes	"Yes."Y	es Yes	Yes Yes
COLLEGE CONFERENCE OF ILL & WIS		s No Ye	s Yes	Yes 2Y	es Yes	Yes Y	es :	_ Yes	Yes:	es y on si		No. I	No '-		`. <u>_`</u> `		_	<u> </u>	Yes :-	` <u>-</u> .	`_ <u>,</u> _	<u> 9</u>	ΞΞ	<u>*</u> .	= =		bs · Yes	Yes Yes
COLORADO ATHLETIC CONFERENCE COLORADO CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY	. II	s > No , Ye	₹ ¥ Ξ	[二]	≝ -[⊒'	₹	- ÷ - '		: . 글; ⁾ .	<u> </u>	* *	, —	- Ya	s Yes Yes	, Yes - 1	No `No	₹ No	No Yes	No		— : — •No No		Yes Yes		es Yes	Yes N	o Yes	Yes Yes
COLURADO COLLEGE	z ₩ Ξ	_ * ` ` ` `	I: I	\$=*:		: - -:	$\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}$		* -		1	- -	⊥ Ye:	s Yes Yes		No Yes		- Yes	Yes ~-	. 193		,				_YesN		_No_Yesi
UNIV. OF COLORADO-CO SPRINGS				Yes Y	es Yes	No I	no Yes	No Ye		Yes		No I	— Yes No —	s Yes Yes	Yes A	bs Yes	No Y	es Yes	Yes -	_		_				Yes N		No Yes Yes Yes
COLODADO STATE UNIVERSITY			No Yes es Yes	Yes Y	es Yes es Yes	Yes Y	es Yes — Yes	Yes N No Ye	o Yes s No	Yes No	q	No	No – 'es –				Ξ		Yes -			_		_ :				Yes Yes Yes Yes
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY-BARNARD COLLEGE	1-A Ye 1-AA Ye - II -	s No Y	es Yes	NO 1	es res	163		_ =			g	-	= -	, -				·	,- -		- -		·= ·,=,				-, -,	7.77
COLUMBUS COLLEGE COMMONWEALTH COAST CONFERENCE:	, jii -			: =:		· <u> </u>	<u>エゴ</u>	`= · -		<u> </u>	4: "	₹.			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	,	N	o´ No ´	No No	Yes	No Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes .Y	es Yes	Yes Yes
CONCORDIA COLLEGE MOORHEAD CONCORDIA COLLEGE (N.Y.)	- III - III	_; `_, `	77	· · ·	<u> </u>			<u> `-</u>		o <u>r</u>	*	Ξ,	_ :	: <u>-</u> , -	<u></u> .		. - -			· -	;_	- =	_ =	_,	3 ,	<u>∓</u>]	·= :=:
CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (ILL.)	. (11 · .;		_``_		Ξ,Ξ	``-	. د	,,	 lo Yes	Yes	-		_ •-						→ Ye	Yes	No No	-Yes	No No	Yes .Y	es. No	Yes A	bs Yes. lo Yes	Yes Yes' Yes Yes
CONNECTICUT COLLEGE.	I-AA Y		No Yes		Yes Yes No Yes		Yes Yes Yes No		lo Yes	No	3		es – es –	: <u>-</u> -		_ _	=		Yes -		= =					Yes N	lo Yes	No Yes Yes Yes
COPPIN STATE COLLEGE CORNELL COLLEGE	NI.		Yes Ye		Yes Yes		Yes Yes	No Y	es Yes	Yes	<u>.</u> j	Yes Y	 es -				_		— Ye	-	No No		No —		es Yes 	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes Yes
CORNELL UNIVERSITY STATE UNIV COLLEGE AT CORTLAND					=			 ~~``v_a^_ Ŷ	es No.	No. i.	á	- = .	— - /es —	· -		= -		<u>-</u>	÷ Ne Yes −	No.	Yes_ No	Yes	No Yes	No 3	vio, Yes		es Yes es Yes	Yes Yes No Yes
CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY	I-AAA')	es	Yes: Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye	s:Yes	Yes No	. 183, 1			4.7	· No ·	es -	= = =		Ξ.Ξ	: _ ·	Ξ, Ξ.		= .	. = (=	·		· -		. 🚾		·
DANIFL WEBSTER COLLEGE			Vec · Ve	Nn.	· Yes Ye	5 'Yes	Yes Yes	No I	No Yes		4.9	Yes Y	es –	: : :		Ē, I	ž – "	ヹ゙゙゙゙゙゙゙゙゙゙゙゙゙ヹ゙゚゚゙゙゙゙゙゙゙゚	Yes -	ر تسر	- :	<u>;</u> =::	- <u>-</u>	=	_ =		lo Yes	No Yes
	HAAA.	res No:	Yes; Ye	s 4Yes	Yes Ye	s .Yes.	Yes . Yes	"YesY	es : Yes — —	ئىدىدىنىيەر Yes . —	#	Yes -	No				``-		Yes –	· -		~~~	_ , _			185 1	es Yes. — —	Yes Yes
DAVIC AND ELVING COLLEGE	. II .I-AAA	 - No	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes No	<u> </u>	No Yes No Yes		1	No	No -				-		No -	_		-		_			es Yes es Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes
DEPAUL UNIVERSITY	I-AAA	Yes No	Yes Ye	es Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes No	Yes		_		No Y	es -	:	= :		_	= =	Yes ~	No	No No	Yes \	Yes No	Yes Y	es Yes		es —	
DEPAUW UNIVERSITY DEFIANCE COLLEGE	111				Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes No	Yes	No No	Yes	4	.No Y		·					Yes -				<u>= =</u> :	₹.	ΞĮ		o Yes	No Yes
DELAWARE STATE COLLEGE	35.00	Yes Yes	, — '-	lo No	-	_ , _				Yes 3		Vec	Nio :		Ξ.	= =		_ ==	Yes ∸	o ≥ No ⊲	Yes No		No Yes	-No , I	No Yes	Yes Y	'es Yes. io Yes'	No Yes Yes Yes
DELAWARE VALLEY COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE	I-AA II	Yes No	Yes , Ye	es Yes	Yes Ye	es No −, −,	No Yes			: <u>-</u> ?	A	-	- Ye	s Yes Yes	Yes Y	es . Yes		No No		· · — /	No - No	· ~— *	<u>"</u> — . —			Yes N	lo Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes
DELTA STATE UNIVERSITY DENISON UNIVERSITY			i and in	° _ = .	·= -	- •			27-4-7	الله الله الله الله الله الله الله الله	1	تر <u>ــ</u> ـــ		,-	,				— N	; AU'	nu - NU	- 143 -	.1101 110	. 140	.eg . 199	اندون	~- 103.	
					100	2 (7.1		P.	0000	dines		DII	ر م	I Maria	•													A-189
A-188					199.	2 COI	uventt	on Fl	vi ee	dings	1	KOH	•Cal	l Votinț	· —													W-103
·····											4																	

	14	15	15 18	.1 18	10	20-1 2	20 21-	21-1	21-8	24 2	5-1 Z	j			26	30	14 E	20-1 	20 21- 11 1	A 29	30 I VT	34 64 TR	28 A	100	n utt	31-1 31	ш		33 Å	33 37 B C	3 28 B	34 AD	36 15	4 35	
MEMPER NAME Div.										~	- Park	· · · · ·	بنب	-	$\bar{z} = 0$	_ Y	es Ye		Yes N	łõNo	`No	<u> </u>	s	:	- · -		_ ₹		=		No.	Yes	Yes Y	és Yes	
MEMBER NAME UNIVERSITY OF DENVER. LAAA UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT MERCY LAAA REVERSION OUT LEGE III	·	Ain \	is Ve	s No	Yes .	Yes ,: Ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes		es Ye	1.1	100°	,	NO:	No :	ΞΞ	- =		= :=	· <u> </u>	<i>I.</i> :	- NO	No. N	lo Yes	No Y	es ?N	lo Yes	~ No' '	Yes Ye	s Yes - No	- Yes No	Yes, Y	es Yes es Yes No Yes	i
UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT MERCY	- 100				_;	= 1	<u> </u>	· ' <u>'</u> '	; <u> </u>	=	- ::: - ::		14		%	<u> </u>	es Ye	Yes	Yes 1	lo Yes	No`∙												Yes'	No Yes	,
UNIVERSITY OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	_	.=`	Ξ'-	- .	<u> </u>	'\!	- "=	<u>. </u>	_	_	- '.'-		-33			_ Y	res Ve	e Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes	- N	o — - Yes	_ :		_ :	_ :		_		- Yes	Yes	Yes 1	res Yes	
UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT MERCY	Yes	No '	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes Y	es –	- Yes	Yes	Yes 1	es Ye	5		1			= =	=	Ξ		_			No N	le No	Yes A	bs 1	ło No	No —	No Ye	s No - Yes	Yes No	Yes Y	No Yes Yes Yes	
DANKE UNIVERSITY INDREW UNIVERSITY INDREW UNIVERSITY AAA NEEXEL UNIVERSITY AAA UNIVERSITY OF DUBBOUE INDRESSITY IAA DUKE UNIVERSITY IAA COLORES UNIVERSITY IAA CARLEA UNIVERSITY IAA EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY IAA EAST COAST CONFERENCE IAAA EAST SCROUING UNIV OF PA	- Vec	No.	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes	Yes Y	es Ye	s Yes	_	No 1	res N	0	2,		No	No —	= =				<i>.</i> = ,	_= =	- 163			-		-,,-	<u></u>		 Yes	· No [®]	Voc V	Yes Yes	
OREXEL UNIVERSITY	_		= ;			Vec >	es Ye	š Yes	Yes	No "	Yes Ye	5 7	- 60	.	Yes No	Yes No			<u></u> -:		<u>-</u>	ΈΞ	- Yes - Yes		= =	 No A	:	- :=	Œ	Ξ.,	– Yes	'Yes	Yes '	res	•
DUKE UNIVERSITY	i Yes A Yes	Yes .	No Y	es No	Yes.	Yes,	es Ye	s No	-	Yes ,	Yes • Ye	× ;	ار د	- 4	Yes	. — .		· <u> </u>	, <u> </u>		` <u></u> ' •	_ 3	- , - Yes	No. Y	es No	No A	bs , Y	es (No	NO	Yes re	es Yes - Yes	'Yes	Yes '	Yes Yes	ι
EARLHAM COLLEGE	l − \.Yes	- No -	Yes , Y	es Ye	Yes	Yes.	No A	lo Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes Y	85 °` 85 •?⊲		-4	, No.	. = -	Ξ.,-	- ,			<u> </u>		Yes			-=-	: · ·				±∴Yes — Yes	, Yes. Yes		No Yes Yes Yes	í
EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY EAST COAST CONFERENCE EAST STROUBSBURG UNIV OF PA EAST STROUBSBURG UNIVERSITY EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY LAGST TENAE STATE LUNIVERSITY	A Yes	No .	No Y	′es^N⊲ — –	, Yes - —	TES				_		_			Yes	No			Yes 1		Yes -	res ve	- Yes		= =	=	_		_				Yes Yes	No Yes	
EAST STROUDSBURG UNIV OF PA EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY	A Yes	No.	Yes	No N	yes -	Yes	Yes Y	es No	Yes	Yes	NO 1	_			Ha	No.	No Ye	s Yes	Yes	No No			s Yes - Yes	- :		Ţ	Ξ :			·	- Yes	Yes	Yes	No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	
EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY	iA Yes	No.	Yes	ies N	o Yes	Yes	Yes Y	es Ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes Y	es 	دانست	<u>-</u>	, T ,	— No					-	-E ,	- "YPS	No _!	No No	Yes 1		NO_TES	. Ita		- Yes	, No	Yes U	Yes Yes	į
EAST STROUDSBURG UNIV OF PA EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY EASTERN COLLEGE ATHLETIC CONFERENCE LASTERN CONNECTICUL STATE UNIVERSITY EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY LEASTERN MENONITIE COLLEGE EASTERN MENONITIE COLLEGE EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE	II− A`Ye:	s No	No '	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes	No N	o No	No No	Yes /	es 🧐	ر موتور		Yes	No	Ξ.	- i . —	, - ,	- :-	_	· 🖃 - 🗟	- Yes	No i	— — No «Yes	No 1	رئ انssدا	 No Yes	- Yes	No. 1	— Yes Vo Yes	- No Yes	, 100		
EASTERN ILLINGIS UNIVERSITY EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY I-A	A Ye	5 < NO	Yes	Ves Ye	s Yes	-¥Y€S	TES T		- , , - , ,		Vac	No.	. 7	6	. No	No -		: <u>:</u>	` <u>`</u> .		, <u> </u>		- Yes	. <u> </u>		. <u> </u>	_;	_` =	žΞ,	. – *-	— Yes	No Yes		Yes Yes Yes Yes	
FASTERN MENNONITE COLLEGE FASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY	A Ye	s . No	/Yes	Yes N	o Yes	Yes	Yes	NO N		- MQ.	}, , , .		<u> </u>		=	· =	Yes Ye	s _Yes 	Yes,		- NO												Yes	Abs Yes	
EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSIT EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE EASTERN NEW MEXICO UNIVERSITY EASTERN SIATES ATHLETIC CONF LASTERN SIATES ATHLETIC CONF EASTERN SIATES ATHLETIC CONF ENSINGING UNIVERSITY OF PA	ид — Ш —		-			_	_			_	_	_	4]	-	=			Yes	No Yes	s No	Yes Y	es Yes	_			Ξ	= =	Ξ	_ :	_ '		_	103 103 	
FACTEDNI NEW MEXICO LINIVERSITY	11 -							_		Yes	Yes	 Yes		ļ	No		_ :		_				→ Yes			_	_		_		Yes		-	163 163	
EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	VA YE	s No	Yes	Yes Y	es re:	103	163				Ξ.			! :	; 5	<u> </u>	Yes Y	S Yes	-Yes	No 'N	No.	Yes 1	es Yes		÷ :	7-7	-7	= ++=	ξ̄Ξ,	, <u>–</u>	- Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes _Yes	ļ
ASSIENT NATES ATHLETIC CONF EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY ECKERD COLLEGE EDINBORO UNIVERSITY OF PA ELIZABETH CITY STATE UNIVERSITY ELIZABETH COLLEGE ELIMIRST COLLEGE ELIMIRST COLLEGE ELIMIRS COLLEGE) - 	= =	Ė	= `	- 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5			1.3			·- <u>-</u> -′,	=: <	* \$* \$n	ľ .	_	_	Yes Y	s Yes	Yes .	ND IN	, NO	٠ <u>۵</u> .		Yes	No Ye	s Yes	Yes	No Yes	· No	No I	No Yes	.Abs	Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	ł
ELIZABETH CITY STATE UNIVERSITY		Ξ; Ξ	Ξ.		_^-	Ξ	<u> </u>	Ξ,	- *-	7	· 🗔	_ < 3	٥,	1	· :=	÷Ξ,		_ <u>.</u> =	=	<u>_`</u> ,	- <u></u>	Ξ	<u> </u>	YES +	<u> </u>	, <u> </u>	<u>'</u> -,							====	ï
ELMHURST COLLEGE	# 4	_: _	ŞΞ	``	<u> </u>	:`:'	<u>'</u> _	. ,	<u>-</u>	- ÷	. =-	×		1	_	_	_	es Yes	_	L -		_	 No No				Ξ		_	_	_ N	D No	Yes	Yes Yes	i
ELMIS COLLEGE	l)) -		_	_	_ :		_	_			-	_		3	_	_	- ·		- 153			_		_			_	<u> </u>	_	=	_ =		_	_ =	
FLON COLLEGE	Ű	_ ~	-	_			_	_		-	_	-		4	_	_	Ξ.	=	- -	Ξ.Ξ	_ =	=		- ,			,- <u>-</u>				— No∵Ye		Yes	Ahe Ves	. 7
EMMANUEL COLLEGE	ij				7, 3	.	ε <u>-</u> :	ρĒ	_ :				<u></u> ژ]	· <u>-</u>	_	_ '			_ =		=	=′′Ξ	Yes	No Ye	s Yes s Yes	Yes	No . Yes	No.	No Y	res Ye	s - Yes	Yes	Abs ~ Yas	
EMERSON COLLEGE-MASS COL OF ART EMMANUEL COLLEGE EMORY UNIVERSITY EMMIRE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY ERSKINE COLLEGE EUREKA COLLEGE EUREKA COLLEGE EUREKSITY OF EVANSVILLE	10 - 11	= =	=	,_;	= :-		=	<u>.</u>	_ :		_		4,	-	-	_	Yes Y		Yes	No Ye	s No	No)	es No	· —			Ξ,	Ξ. Ξ	· -	Ξ.	_ N	0 NO	- 1	· i = 1 = 1	ij
EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY	- li *		<u> </u>	· - ·	= "	- ; -	Ţ <u>.</u>		<u>-</u> :			Ξ	- 75	Ž.	_	÷	_	==			1	_	_ <u>-</u>	_			_	<u> </u>	. -	; 		s Yes	; — s Yes	No Yes	5
ERSKINE COLLEGE EUREKA COLLEGE	16-`	— — Vec N	_ · — In Yes	Yes	بىر—. No Y	–, — es Yes	No	Yes	Yes Y	es N	o Yes	Yes		9	No Yes	No	_	= =	_			=	— Yes			s No	 Vac	No N	- Ves	No.	— Ye Yes N	s Yes	s Yes	Yes Yes	; 5
UNIVERSITY OF EVANSVILLE	AAA	Yes N	lo Yes	No	Yes Y	es Yes	yes -	Yes —	No Y	es Ye	S 183	NO -		j	No.	- No	_	- -	_	_ :		_	_ N	. NO	NO 16					_	_ N	o Yes	s Yes	Yes Yes	
FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON UNIVERISTY-MADISON FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON UNIVERSITY-TEANECK	AAA	Yes N	lo Yes	Yes	Yes Y	es Ye:	s No	No	_ ,	es Ye	s Yes	Yes		<u>}_</u>	, -	,-	Yes 1	es Ye	s Yes	No A	lo_No	Yes	No _Ye: (es : Ye:		- :	Ξ. Ξ	$\bar{\mathcal{L}}$	=-=		 -	Ţ, Ye	S Yes	Yes.	Abs. Ye	
FAYETTEVILLE STATE UNIVERSITY	11 11	, II	3 2	~; <u> </u>	-	=		Ţ=;	70	_ ;			و مری	ďĽ			TES	=, ',;;				9 T 2			= :-		Ξ	Ĭ.,	ďΞ) <u>-</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			į
FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY FERRUM COLLEGE	ı iji :	:- ·	_ / 注	: =	Ξ.		Ţ, Ę	: .:::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::		Ξ ;	- :-	<u>ش</u> ر	3.17			· ; = ;		_ :=	-'y <u></u> , ',	_ ;	- 1 - - 1 - 1 - 1	<u>;</u> -`,	Ξ_{i}^{*}			<u>- E</u>	` <u>-</u> `	÷ . :	<u>:</u> :	Ξ.	_:: <u>``</u>	s No	Yes	No. Ye	s
FISK UNIVERSITY FITCHBURG STATE COLLEGE	. III	vi⊆ k. Ves X	es a No	بَّدُ No.	No	No Ye	- : .— IS \$, No	Yes	· No:	No,-I	lo Yes	Yes	لأخف	4	No	Yes:	Yes Y	es Ye	t.⊤ s Yes	Yes Y	s Yes	Yes	No Ye	s -			_	_		_		s Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye	s
EMYONIA STATE ONNERSITY ERSKING COLLEGE EUREKA COLLEGE EUREKA COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF EVANSVILLE FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY FAIRLIGH DICKINSON DIVIVERSITY-MADISON FAIRLIGH DICKINSON UNIVERSITY-TEANECK FAVETTEVILLE STATE UNIVERSITY FERRIS TATE UNIVERSITY FERRIS TATE UNIVERSITY FICH UNIVERSITY	ال ال			_	_	_ :	- <u>-</u>	_	_	_ :				4	N.		Yes '	es Ye	s Yes	No Y	es No	No —	No Ye	s — s —	_ :		_			Ξ	- Ye	s Ye	s Yes	Abs Ye	ś
FIGN UNIVERSITY FICHIBUSES STATE COLLEGE FICHIBUSES STATE COLLEGE FICHIBUSES STATE COLLEGE FICHIBUSES STATE UNIVERSITY FLORIDA INSTITUTE OF IECHNOLOGY FLORIDA INSTITUTE OF IECHNOLOGY FLORIDA SOUTHERN COLLEGE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA FONTEONNE COLLEGE FORDHAM UNIVERSITY FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY FORT LEWIS COLLEGE FORT LEWIS COLLEGE	Ι -ΑΑΑ-	Yes	No Ye	s Yes	No	Yes Ye	s No	Yes	Yes	Yes Y	es Ye:	s Yes		1	Voc	Yes	Yes '	res N	o Yes	No -	- No	_	No Ye — Ya	s – s	= =						— Ye	s Ye	5 Yes	Yes Ye	S.
FLORIDA SOUTHERN COLLEGE	II F-A	Yes	No Ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes Y	s Yes	No	Yes -	Yes_Y	es Ye	5 - VAE		178	Yes								Ve	•	- , ,	LS No	No.	No v Ye	s No	No.	No. Y	s. Ye	s Yes	Yes (Ye	S
INIVERSITY OF FLORIDA	I-A	√Yes -	No ∙Ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	es Yes	NO.	Yes	ies	NU - 14	3 163 	مهائج دود	7	mr Yes	. — S Ýes	-	<u> </u>	- 2		<u>-</u>	<u> </u>	: Ye	s —		es No	=	<u> </u>		, <u>E</u>	Υ ₁	es No	Yes	No Ye	S
FONTBONNE COLLEGE	i-AA	Yes :	No Ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes , Y	es Ye	s∵Yes ∵—	· Yes :	_ ;			-34	3 :	<u> </u>	: =	Yes No.	res Ye res Ye	s Yes s Yes	No 'Y No , t	es "No No No	No.	Yes re Yes Ye	s — s —	-	= =	. <u> </u>	====	<u></u>		<u>~</u> _Y	es: Ye	s:LYes	_Yes_Ye	s
FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY	1	ز ـ ــــــ ئي	: <u>-</u> ;-		. = 4	<i>=</i> ``		š. . .	· =	·-	<u>-</u> -:	_ `		7	_	· _	Yes	Yes Ye	5 NO	No Y	es No	NO	NO TE	S	No V	ee No	Nn	No Ye	s No	Yes	No Ye	es No es Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye	5
FORT VALLEY STATE COLLEGE	. O	_	_ :		=	_			-	=	_ :	= =		1	-	=	Yes	Yes Ye	s No	No Y	es No	Yes	Yes Ye	S —	No Y	es Yes	Yes	No Ye	— s No	No	Yes Y	es No es Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye	5 :5
FRAMINGHAM STATE COLLEGE FRANCIS MARION COLLEGE	11	=	_ :		_	_	_ :		=	_	- :			<u> </u>	. =	-	Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	No Y	es Yes	No	Yes_Ye	s			. . .				Yi	es Ye	s Yes	No Ye	S
FRANKLIN & MANSHALL GOLLEGE	, [·*	٦.		7.	- <u>,-</u>	<u>-</u> -		🚾	<u></u>	= :		,	7	· -	: =	Ξ.			_:		<u>v</u>	_ :	- Yes - Yes	No Y	Ao No	Yes	· No · Ye	ş×, Yes	No	, No. Y	es Ye	s Yes	: Yes Ye	
STATE UNIV. COLLEGE AT FREDONIA	. "III	Yes	,—;	_: _	. ج <u>يّ</u> ۷	Vec.	yes k	in Yes	Yes	Yes ·	Yes Y	es Yés	, ,	ş.	Ye	s No	<u>~</u>	_ ,-	= =	=	_ `=	:==	-, Ye	s —. - No	- T- 1	No . No	· Yes	· No : Yo	s. No) No	Yes Y	es Ye	s Yes	No Ye	S
STATE UNIV. COLLEGE AT FREDONIA FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY. FURMAN UNIVERSITY.	I-AA	Yes :	NO	NO TE	(55	t	.ca P	- ·	-	=	<u>`</u>		,	ji u			Yes 1	Yes 'Ye	es Yes	Yes - y Y	es Yes	Yes	Yes Ye	s —	·	es Yes es No No No No No	-	===			, = `.Y	es - ,	is . Yes	TOS . YE	5
FURMAN UNIVERSITY GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY GANNON UNIVERSITY	(+ 6		. —· :		, - T					-	•			7																					
-							11 C	a 101 / 1		n D	race	edin	29	1	R	oll-C	Call	Votin	18 <u> </u>															A-19	,
A-190						199	12 C	onve	mio	71 1	ULE	edin	0,2	1																					

MEMBER NAME ON	14 16 1 MTR	16 18-1 11	18 20-1	20 21-A 21-1	21-8 24	25-1 25 MTB			26	903 144 	19 20-1 Li II	20 21-A II il		0 34 B VTR	14 28 A	12-1 32 ABCD	31 31- VTS	1 31-2 A	31 33-1 HE	33 3 A E	33	28 34 8 A0	i	154 35
GARDNER-WEBB COLLEGE II GATEWAY COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONF. I-AA Y STATE INIV COLLEGE AT GENESEO III		T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T		Yes Yes Yes	Vec - Yes	Yes Yes		\$ 60.	No i	- No 	Yes Yes	No No	No N	o No Y	es No Yes Yes Yes	Abs No	No Ye	s Yes.	No Yes	No N	io No	Yes Ye	s Yes' s Yes	— Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
GEORGE MASUN UNIVERSITY I-AAA GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY I-AAA GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY I-AAA	— No Yi es Yes M	es Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes No	Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes	- res Yes No	Yes Yes	اُلِيَّا اِلْمُعَادِدُهُ ج ج	<u></u> :	No i	es — io — — Yes io —	Yes Yes		Yes Ye	s – Y	— Yes No es Yes No	= =	= :			- :		Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY LAAA CEORGIA STATE INNIVERSITY LAAA	es Yes I	No Yes Yes No Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	X	T.	No Y	es — es — es , —	= = = =	<u> </u>			- Yes		_ =				`	Yes No	e Vac	Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
GETTYSBURG COLLEGE. III GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE. III GONZAGA UNIVERSITY. IAAA	Yes No.	No Yes Ye	Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Yes ` No	Yes No	ا الله الله الله الله الله الله الله ال	in 2 name	No i	ic _			= :	. I	- 105	No Yes	No Yes N	0	No · No	No N	lo No	Yes Yes	S TES	TES TES
GOUCHER COLLEGE GRAMBLING STATE UNIVERSITY II GRAMBLING STATE UNIVERSITY II	No Yes	No Yes Ye	s Yes No	Yes Yes Yes	TES NO	Yes Yes			No Y	es — — Yes — Yes — Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Abs	Yes No Yes Yes — No	Yes Yes Yes Yes										- Yes s Yes y Yes	No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
GRAND CARTON OWNERSITY GRAND VALLEY STATE LINIVERSITY GREAT LAKES INTERCOL ATHLETIC CONF GREAT LAKES VALLEY CONFERENCE GREAT MIDWEST CONFERENCE GREAT MIDWEST CONFERENCE GREAT MIDWEST CONFERENCE GREAT MIDWEST CONFERENCE III GRINNELL COLLEGE GROVE COTY COLLEGE III	Yes No	Yes Yes Ye	s Yes Yes	Yes Yes No	yės No	Yes. Yes			No Y	S	res Yes	No -	No No	No No .	lo Yes - Yes	Yes Yes		Yes i	– – No Yes No Yes	No N	D Yes	Yes No Yes ≠Ye Yes Ye Yes Ye	Yes s Yes s Yes s Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No —
GUILFURD DULLEGE								-	: - :	= = .	 /es Yes			No -	- Yes	Yes No	- N Yes N Yes N	o yes i	NO NO	NO YE	S YOS '	Yes Yes	s Yes	Yes Yes Yes —
GUSTAYUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE HAMILTON COLLEGE HAMILTON EDITORESTTY		:				1,1	100 m		= :	 - No	 No Yes ·	 No (No	 Yes *No		=	No No	No No	Yes I	No Vac	No Ye	s Yes	No Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
HARDIN-SIMMONS UNIVERSITY I-AAA UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD III	Yes No	Yes Yes Y	es" Yes -Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes		3	No' N	lo —		= =			Yes Yes	Yes No	Yes Yes	Yes I	No Yes	No No	o Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Abs. Yes: No Yes: Yes Yes
HARVARD UNIVERSITY IIA HAVERFORD COLLEGE III HAVERSITY OF HAWAII I-A HRIDELBERG COLLEGE III	Yes No		es Yes Yes	Yes Yes Ye	s Yes Yes	Yes No			No Ye	: _ !s _ - No \	es No	 No No	Yes No		- 🗀 🔻	Yes No 			No Yes	No Yes	s Yes \		Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes —
HILLSDALE COLLEGE HIRAMOTERIA SMITH COLLEGES	Yes No		No Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes		√3.1 √3.1	Yes - N					= =	- Yes	- No	Yes Yes	Yes I	No No	Yes Yes	∕∖ s Yes \	— ∵ — — Yes Yes Yes Yes : —	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes
HOPSTRA WINVERSITY I.AAA HOPSTRA WINVERSITY III HOLLINS COLLEGE I.AA HOOD COLLEGE III HOPE COLLEGE III UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON I.AA						Yes Yes		-	No N	 	 	 	= =	= =	-, Yes \ - Yes	es No	<u> </u>	Yes M	-: ·-·		-:	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
HOWARD UNIVERSITY HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY	- Yes	No Yes	Yes Yes Ni — — —	No tes ti	5 163 4 				No Ye	Yes Y		Yes No			res	es Yes	Abs Yes	No f	No Yes	No Yes	- — ! s Yes Y	— Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO ILLINOIS BENEDICTINE COLLEGE	Yes No	Yes Yes	Tes Tes Te	s Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Y	es Yes N es Yes M	lo Yes 'No Io Yes Ye			Yes N		= ·=	_ · _		<u>.</u> <u></u>	Yes		Yes No	_ :	= =	No No	Yes Y	Yes Yes Yes No	Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY	i — — A Yes No	Yes Yes	Yes Yes Ye	s Yes Yes	No Yes Yes Yes Yes	es Yes Ye	- S S		Yes Ye No Ye	s — s —		<u> </u>	= =		Yes No	= =	Yes No	= :	10 No	No No	- Y	Yes No No Yes	Yes Yes	
IMMACULAIA CULLEGE INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY I-A. INDIANA UNIVERSITY (PA) INDIANA UNIVERSITY PA INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON I- INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON I- INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON I- UNIVERSITY OF INDIANAPOLIS IONA COLLEGE INDIANTERPOLI EGEATE ATHI FEEL CONF	A Yes No II — — — A Yes No	No Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Y	es Yes Yes \	es Yes Y No Yes Y	es Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	S		No N Yes Ye		es Yes J	Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes' Yes	Yes Ye Abs No	s Yes Yes Yes	= =	· = · =			··=	. – Y	Yes No: Yes Yes	Yes - Yes Yes	No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes;
INDIANA UNIV. PURIDUE UNIV. 4 WATRE UNIVERSITY OF INDIANAPOLIS IONA COLLEGE IOWA INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONF	Ü'' → r = VA Yes Yes III → → A Yes Na	s No Yes	No Yes Y	es Yes No	Yes Yes Y	es Yes You			No Ye	š —	es Yes	- -	Yes Yes	= =	Yes Yes Yes	 No No	Yes No	Yes N	ło No	No Yes	- 1 5 No Y	No Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes	
TOWA STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF IOWA ITHACA COLLEGE WY GROUP	A Yes N	o Yes Yes	Yes Yes Y	es Yes Yes es Yes Yes No No Yes	Yes Abs \\ No ·No .	es res re 	15 3.72		Yes y Ve No N	s — · s — ·					Yes-	No No	Yes Yes	Yes_N	lo Yes	No No	- Yes Y - Yes Y Y	es Yes les Yes les No les No	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No Yes No Yes
IONA COLLEGE IONA INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONF IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF IOWA ITHACA COLLEGE IVY GROUP JACKSON STATE UNIVERSITY JACKSON STATE UNIVERSITY JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY	AA Yes Ye AA Yes N	s No Yes to Yes Yes	No Yes Yes	es Yes Yes Yes Yes No	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No Yes Y	es Vo	je i	No N	- res Y	ES - TES '	tes res	res No	NO -	Yes No		 	- <u>=</u> , <u>=</u>			Y	es Yes No No	Yes Yes	res Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
A-192			199	2 Conven	tion Pr	oceedir	igs				oting												A	A-193

14_16	15 18-1 18	19 20-1	26 21-A 21-1 21-8	: 24 25-1 25 MTR		28 30	14 19 20-1	20 21 A 2	9 30 34 11 VTR	64 28 #2 A	1 32 3 ABCO VTS		31 33-1 3 A-E A	3 33 33 8 C	28 34 8 A-D	36 154 35
MEMBER MAME QNY I MATR JERSEY CITY STATE COLLEGE III		 	, , 		63	. <u> </u>		:		N	No No N	o∵No No"	No Yes Ye	s Yes Yes	Yes Ye	Yes No Yes
JERSEY CITY STATE COLLEGE	_:_:	I-1	: <u>I.J</u>	,= = = (3)	330	≃'			` - `	– <i>–</i> }	No No Ye	s No Yes	Yes Yes N No Yes N	o'No Yes	Yes Ye	Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes (
JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY		_=		: = .= .= : * ²	· · · · ·	² = =		<u> </u>	s No No Y	_ • _ · Ÿ	es No Ye	s Yes Yes	No Yes N	o No No	Yes Ye	Yes Yes Yes Yes
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY	三、三海	, <u></u>	화결 공연	j =v = %=kil 그	2.1	,	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Ye	s No No Y	es Yes -					Yes No	Yes Yes Yes
JOHNSON C. SMITH UNIVERSITY				-	1	= =					No No Ye		No Yes Ye	s No No	Yes Ye	Yes Yes Yes
JUNIATA COLLEGE III		- -		= <u>=</u> =	1					Y	es No Ab	is No Yes	No No N	o Yes Yes	Yes Yes	s Yes Yes Yes
KALAMAZOO COLLEGE HA Yes No	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Y	es Yes Yes Yes	No Yes Yes No Yes Yes	1	No No No Yes		= = =		— Yes ·	:	===	= $=$ $=$			
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS	Yes Yes Yes	162 162 1	2 12 12 12 12		<u> </u>	- :-	Yes Yes Yes No No Yes Yes Yes Yes		- I- I- II	_ ^ _ Y	es No N	o No Yes	No Yes N	o∵ No`Yes'	Yas Ye	Yes No Yes
KEAN COLLEGE	, <u>-</u>	(E)		Yes Yes Yes		Yes No	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	s Yes No Y	es yes ·			֓֓֓֞֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓	: <u>**</u> ***	Yes Ab	
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY	Yes Yes No	Yes Yes	es yes No ter		- No.	· Ξ Ξ	No No Yes	Yes No Ye	s Yes* No Y	es Yes .		-,	` }- ``;-• -		Yes No	Yes Yes No:
KENTUCKY STATE UNIVERSITY	<u> </u>	1200	#"T-17" E			. — — No No	Yes Yes Yes	Yes No Ye	s Yes No Y	es No -	:	-	·=.=	<u></u>	Yes No	_Yes Yes Yes
KENTUCKY WESLEYAN COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY LA YES NO KENNON COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY KENNON COLLEGE KINGS COLLEGE KINGS COLLEGE KINGS COLLEGE KINGTOWN UNIVERSITY OF PA LA SALLE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE LAFAYETTE COLLEGE LAKE SUPERIOR STATE UNIVERSITY LAMAR UNIVERSITY LAMAR UNIVERSITY LAMAR UNIVERSITY LAMAR UNIVERSITY LAMAR UNIVERSITY LAMAR UNIVERSITY LEMOYNE COLLEGE LEBONON VALLEY COLLEGE	Yes Yes No	Yes Yes	No Yes Yes No	No Yes Yes	4	MO WO	= = =	= = :		_ 'es '	No No N	o No Yes	No Yes N	o No Yes	Yes Ye	
KENYON COLLEGE		= =		. – – –	14								No Yes Ye			s Yes Yes Yes
KEUKA COLLEGE III — —					4	= =	= = =			:						
KNOX COLLEGE	·조 교회	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	<u> </u>		Tg -:	<u>.</u>	Yes Yes Yes	Yes No Ye	s -` Y	es Yes -	ĖĒ:		-5,5		Yes Ye	
KUTZTOWN UNIVERSITY OF PA.	Yes Yes Yes	s Yes Yes	res No Yes re	s No No Yes 🚉	· 4.	Yes Yes	= $=$ $=$	`= = :	= = '	— res - — — N	No No N	D No Yes	No Yes N	o No Yes	Yes No	
UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE	Vec Vec Vec	Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Ye	s No Yes Yes 🐤	1	No No			-,	— No :	_ ,	o No Yes o Yes Yes	No. Yes N		No No	
LAFAYETTE COLLEGE	77.75		æ — `# =				No Yes Yes	No No Ye	s No Abs	es No	es res n	0 162 162	NO. 165 N	o Abs No	No - 5	s Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes
LAKE SUPERIOR STATE UNIVERSITY	Von Abr Ni	o Vac Vac	Yes Yes Yes Ye	s No Yes Yes	4	No No			s Yes No	- Yes					Yes Ye	s Yes Yes Yes s Yes Yes Yes
LAMAR UNIVERSITY							Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Ye	s Yes No I	No Yes - — — Y	es Yes N	lo No No	Yes No N	n Yes Yes	Yes Ab	s Yes Yes Yes s Yes No Yes
AWRENCE UNIVERSITY	·						Yes Yes Yes	No No A	o Yes Yes	No Yes -					Yes Ye	s Yes Yes Yes
LEMOYNE COLLEGE					3	′ ,— "— '	`_`_` `	: "#	>- '	-;:	- T		No Ves Ve	e "Vec Voc	Voc A	Voc Ver Ver
LE MOYNE-OWEN COLLEGE		- : :	Van Van Ves V	es 'Yes Yes Yes'	* # Y.E.	Yes Yes	<u> </u>			- Yes		, is is.	.— ; — ; —	3 (ES (ES,	Yes Ye	s Yes Yes Yes
LEHIGH UNIVERSITY	yes No Ye	S'183 183	. – ; – ; – ; .	_ ' ``,			-,	-,	-" - "	– – Y	'es No Ye	s Yes Yes	Yes Yes N	o No Yes	Yes –	Yes Yes Yes
LEHMAN COLLEGE			ಸ್ವಾಚ್∀್ಬ್		-3-2		Vec Vec Vec	Yes No N	n No No Y	es Yes		·	[[12]	: :	Yes No	Yes Yes Yes
LEWIS UNIVERSITY	Ver Vec Ve	e Ves Ves	Yes Yes Yes Y	es Yes Yes No	3	No Abs				- No -					Yes Ye	Yes
LIBERTY UNIVERSITY			= = -		Ţ		Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Ye	s Yes Yes I	No Yes	:	= =	= = =		Yes No	Yes Yes Yes
LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY	. <u>.</u>						Yes Yes Yes	Yes No Ye	s No No	Yes Yes -			<u>,-,</u> -	,	Yes No	Yes No Yes
LINCOLN UNIVERSITY (MD)			**************************************				<u> </u>	<u> </u>	s Yes — is No No Y is No Yes Y is No Yes Y	:	_ '		ENERS		, , _	:
LINCOLN UNIVERSITY IPA.)	-8 1 :	コルゴルコ	,			= =		Yes Yes Ye	s Yes -	No Yes -	<u> </u>		_ := :=			
LIVINGSTON UNIVERSITY	-	I' I I	. – . – . – . •			H	No Yes Yes No Yes Yes	No No Ye Yes No Ye	s No No Y	es No -	_~_ :		= - *-		No No	
LOCK HAVEN UNIVERSITY	٠٠٠ المالة						Yes Yes Yes	Yes No Ye	s No Yes Y	es No ·	:	'		- <i>-</i> -	Yes Ye	s Yes No Yes
LONE STAR CONFERENCE	;	<u> </u>	= = =		- 1		No Yes Yes	No No N		a No					No No	yes Yes Yes yes yes yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes
LONG ISLAND UNIV-BROUNLYN CONTEN					4		Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Ye	s No Yes	res Yes -	= = =		-	: <u>-</u> -	Yes Ye	s Yes No Yes
LONGWOOD COLLEGE		=	=, == ==	-,-,-,					.	I	No No Ye	s No Yes	Yes Yes N	o Yes No	Yes No	Yes No Yes
CORAS CULLEGE INIVERSITY	s No Yes Y	es Yes Yes	'No No Yes	No No Yes Yes	網大	No Yes		, _ , :		 Yes -	I				Yes No	Yes Yes — :
LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY	lo∵∂No Yes Y Io Yes No Y	es tes tes es yes yes	Yes Yes No	Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	益	No No	· - ·	- -	ر – آ – ر	— Yes ⋅-	,:	:; , , ; - ,		- '- '-'	Yes Ye	s 'Yes" Yes Yes :
UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE	lo. No Yes	les Yes Yes	Yes - Yes	Yes Yes Yes No		Yes Yes No Yes		- <u> </u>		- 162 - Yes -	<u> </u>	:			Yes : Ye	Yes Yes Yes
LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY	VOSTES.⊈NU∠1 Vo Ves Ves 1	res , res , res Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	7	No No	<u> </u>			— No ;			No Yes N		Yes Ye	s Yes Yes Yes
ILEMAN COLLEGE LEWIS UNIVERSITY LIBERTY UNIVERSITY LIBERTY UNIVERSITY LIMESTORE COLLEGE LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY LINCOLN UNIVERSITY (PA.) LITTLE EAST CONFERENCE LIMINGSTONE COLLEGE LIVINGSTONE COLLEGE LIVINGSTONE COLLEGE LOCK HAVEN UNIVERSITY LONE STAR CONFERENCE LONG ISLAND UNIV. CW POST CAMPUS LONG STAR CONFERENCE LONG STAR CONFER			- = =		4						es No N	to Yes Yes				
LYCOMING COLLEGE			= = =		7						No No N		No Yes N			
LYNCHBURG COLLEGE		<u></u>	, 			· , <u>=</u> ,	-5-2,5-5		s Yes Yes		No Yes Ye	s No No	Yes No Ye	s Yes Yes	Yes. Ye	Ves No. Ves
MACALESTER COLLEGE				ŒŒĤŒĸ	1	· <u>-</u> ·	چ س <u>ار</u> اسا	ء : ∸ ' ج	-· - _{\$}	:		5, 5, 5,	No Yes N		. V. V.	S Yes Yes Yes
MAINE MARITIME ACADEMY	No Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes No	Yes Yes Yes Yes Tes. 7.	1 5 E	No No Yes Yes	3.53	4 <u>0.</u> []		— res · · — Yes ·	=	3 7 7'			Yes Ye	Yes Yes Yes
MANHATTAN COLLEGE	NO YES TES	168 165 165			<u> </u>	- =	`- :-' =	<u></u>	-: ˈz., - ; ˈ	- \- · ·	No_No_Ye	s Yes No	No '-, Yes 🖟 N	o No No.	<u></u>	:Yes1
MANHATTANVILLE CULLEGE	~			<u>-</u>	1		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Ye	s Yes Yes	No yes Yes yes	:			= =	Yes Ye Yes Ye	s Yes Yes Yes s Yes Yes Yes
MANSFIELD UNIVERSITY OF PA			= = =	I I I I I	4				s Yes — '	/	No No Ye	s No Yes	No Yes N	o No Yes	- Ye	s Yes Yes Yes
MARIETTA COLLEGE	lbs Yes Yes	No Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes No	1	No Yes				V	no Bio Ve	e No No	No Ver N	n Vet Vec	Vae	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
STATE UNIV OF N.Y MARITIME COL	No Vec Ver	Vec Yet Ve	Yes Yes No.	Yes No Yes Yes	THE PARTY	No Yes	<u> :-</u>			Yes Yes			7. 7.	-	Yes Ye	Yes 'Yes ' Yes
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY	;		, = = , = ,	No 'Vec' Vec Yes	·	No * No *		= = :	: I*I	Yes Yes	,	:	_13		Yes No	Yes Yes Yes
MARSHALL UNIVERSITY	No No Yes	NO SYES SYE	5 (ES NO 16S		19		_:_*_			∸,' ≆ .	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ب کید واست در کردو است		- :-	Yes Yes Yes
MARY BALDWIN COLLEGE	<i>≟`\=</i> "	خد حد ح	·* =: = '=	· - , -, =		-, <u>-</u>	\	. = = =	_ 	 ∑	es NO Ye	is Yes Yes∵	MO Tes. W	u ~ NO _TES	TCS . 10	162 162"
LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY HAAA 'YES. IN LOYOLA UNIVERSITY (ILL.) HAAA YES LUTHER COLLEGE III HARD HA																
		1992	Conventio	n Proceedings	1	Roll-C	Call Voting	g _								A-195
A-194				• '	1		•									

	14	18	16 18-1	18	19 20-1	20 21	1-1 21-1	21-B	24 25	-1 25 MT	•		26	30 1	4 19 2 i ii	0-1 20 : II II	21-A 25	30 II V	34 64 Tr	28 #	2-1 32 AUSCO	31 31-1 VTS	31-2	31 33-1 A-E	33 A	33 3 8 (3 28 3 B	34 3 AD	154	35
MENBER NAME	Oly. (MTR.			 	 - ••		٠	V.	e Yes		77.5	Yes		- ' =	- 7-	-5-	- - ·	-:	Yes	تر بــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	4		¥		<u></u> ;			es Yes	
UNIV. OF MARYLAND-BALTIMORE COUNTY	AAA Yes	/NoY	es No	Yes Y	s Yes	Yes Y Yes Y	les Yes les No	Voc 1	No Ye	s Yes	7.5	ኢ - ^``		Yes -		ΞįΞ	. II	· = •		Yes .	- :-			, <u> </u>	-7 = 4 -3 = 4	·图 13	− - 2 Yes - - Yes *	Yes Y	es / Yes : es / No ^	Yes
UNIV OF MARYLAND-COLLEGE PARK	ha tes AAA Yes	Yes	No No	-No N	to Yes	No Y	res. No	Yes Yes	No Ye	es No		-	· (=		- • - "	_ '-	,	-, -"	— ·'—	, :=·-		~ –્" -	<u>^</u> ,;	·	· 🕁	-:-				/ <u>-</u> }
MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY	III		<u>-</u> -	Ξ.			<u> </u>		÷		* <u>* </u>	سنا	=		. 2		·- " "	:- <u> </u>		<u>. </u>	Yes No	Yes N	o No	No Ye	s No	No h	o Yes	Yes Y	85 —	Yes :
MARYVILLE COLLEGE (IN.)	III —			·-		-		_	_ :		•	1	_	= :		= =		_		_ ,	Yes No	Yes Ye	s Yes	No Ye	s No	No N	o Yes	Yes Y	as No	Yes
MARYWOOD COLLEGE MARYWOOD COLLEGE MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	III	_		= :		_			- :			1	_							-	No No		s Yes		s No		o Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes
	 			=	= =	=	- -		- :		مارسونست	1	_	· _ Y	s Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Ye	- — s No /	. No Yes	Yes	<u> </u>			<u>.=; =</u>			- TYes∑	No Y	es - Yes	Yes
MASSACHUSETTS MARITIME ACADEMY INIVERSITY OF MASSLOWELL	-" -	. ب	es Yes	· 	<u> </u>	You !			Yes Y	— − ′es Ye	- * * * * الاستادات الا		, No	No -	- ; -	= =		= =		Yes,	No No	Yes N	 o Vae	No. No.	Vec	No Ye	Yes Yes		es Yes es Yes	Yes .
TOTAL OF MARCH CONTROL AND CONTROL OF THE PARTY OF THE PA	AA-i III	No 1		No ;	es Yes — —	162								·	_ ` _	Ξ.		_	Ξ, Ξ	' ۔۔۔ '	Yes No	Yes Ve	e Yac	No Ye	S" Yes	No - Ye	s as-	Yec. Y	es. Yes	Yes
	 	s No	L L	Yes \	— : — (es . Yes	- No	No Ye	s Yes	No, Y	es Ye			No.	No -		= =			<u> </u>	Yes .	 Ves Mo	Yes Ye	c Yes	No No	No	Yes Ye	- Yes s -		es No. es No	Yes
MC NEESE STATE UNIVERSITY				_		-		a Yes	No. V		-	3	No	Yes -	=	= =	= =	=	= =	Yes									es Yes	res
MEDGAR EVERS COLLEGE MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY MENLO COLLEGE MERGER UNIVERSITY	I-A Ye	s No 1	Yes Yes	Yes '	res yes — —	YES					~	3	No	No -	= =					Yes			-	_ =	=	_ =	- Yes		es Yes	Yes
MENLO COLLEGE MERCER LINIVERSITY	AAA Ye	s No	Yes Yes	Yes '	res Yes	Yes	No Ye	s Yes	Yes 1	res Ti	:S 		_	- Ye	s Yes s Yes	Yes Yes	No Ye		Yes	Yes	- <u>,</u> -	, - -, -			=~		- Yes	No Y	es No	Yes ⊐∵
MERCER UNIVERSITY MERCY COLLEGE MERCYHIRST COLLEGE MERCHIR COLLEGE MERRYMACK COLLEGE	~~!! <u>~</u> -	 - : - : - : - : - : - : - : - : -		-,	Ξ-,	— -	´-`-	-' -				1	: =	_ "		- 7				, –	-, -	Yes N	Ξ.	_=_ =	` <u>-</u> .	Ξ. Ξ		_E <		4
MERCYHORST COLLEGE MEREDITH COLLEGE	∭-y	-`	$\equiv \cdot \equiv$	<i>Σ</i> <u>Ξ</u> ,		Ξ.	_ :	=	_		در است. ورزان دروران			- Ye		Yes∵Yes. Yes No		o: Yes s No	— Yes	Yes Yes	$\equiv : \equiv$		_, _,)r 7.	इं} Yes े	No Y	es Yes es Yes	
MERRIMACK COLLEGE MESA STATE COLLEGE	38	_, _,	<u>- </u>	`-`	-::-	· <u>-</u>			_ :	Ξ_{i}			<u></u> .	<u>-</u> -	-` =		' - -		-: -		No :_No	Yes N	o Yes	∴—_ Ye	s No	Yes Ye	5 Yes	Yes Y	s Yes	Yes
MESSIAH COLLHGE	.;#?• #		= =	المستندن			_	 					Yes	Yes	= =		_ =	_		Yes		= =	=	= =	=	= =	Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes
	LAAA Y	es No	Yes Yes Yes Yes	res	Yes Yes Yes Yes			es Yes es Yes	No '	Yes Y	es :es	1	No.	Abs -	o Yes	Yes No	O Ye	s No	No	Yes	= =	= =	=		_	_ :			es Yes es Yes	
METROPOLITAN COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONF METROPOLITAN ST COLLEGE OF DENVER	I-AAA Y			_			_		Yes	 Yes Y	es	١	No	No -					_ =	No							- No	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes
DUNIEDCITY OF MIANI IFLA 1	I-AY I-AY		Yes -			S Yes	Yes Y	es Yes es Yes	No .		es -	, , , , ,	· No	No -		_ ' _ '		ξΞ.	_,_	Yes	res . No	_ N	Yes	No. No	No.	Yes Ye	Yes v	No ≤ Ye Yes - Ye	BS LYES	Yes.
MIAMI UNIVERSITY (DH.) MICHIGAN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSN. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY.	. 111.	ڊ <u>-،-</u>	, - ' -	. *			_	— — No · Yes	Yes	No.	— ⊃ No ∞	4 >	· Yes '	Yes N	o Yes	Yes Yes	No Ye	. <u>.</u>	No No	Yes No		= . =	-: =~		No.	<u> </u>	-₃Yes″	No Y	s Yes. S No.	Yes .
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	I-A Y		Yes - N	· · · · ·			_		; <u>—</u>	Yes	(a) (3)		Yes	Yes .	- 100,					Yes		7,		',	`	ت: تــ	No.	No_Y	s Yes	Yes
	I-A · Y	es No es Yes	Yes, Ye	s:Yesi	Yes Ye	IS, YOS.	Yes Y	res Yes res Yes	Yes	Yes	fes	3	No No	Ahs -						Yes Yes			<u> </u>	= =	_	= =			es Yes	Yes —
MID-AMERICAN ATHLETIC CONF	1-AAA	- 24	Yes Ye	S TES	162 16	s Yes		No Yes	No		No Yes		No	Yes -				-		Yes	 Yes No	No Ye	. —	No Yes	Yes	No Ye	- Yes s No	No Y	s No	Yes
MILES OF THE PARTY	LAA Y	es res	No N	0 ~	No Ye		_		_		- -	.l	No	No -				_		Yes							- Tes	No Y	s —	Yes
MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES CONF MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY	III I-AA		Ţ.·		-	– Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Tes	res	nu - 5 - 7	j	-		- -		- -				Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No		Yes No		Yes N Yes Ye		Abs; N Yes Ye	o Yes Is Yes	Ves
MIDDLE TENTY COLLEGE. MIDWEST ATHLETIC COMF. FOR WOMEN. MIDWEST COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONF. MIDWESTERN COLLEGIATE COMF. MILES COLLEGE.	. III. III				; _ :				. –	_				ΞΞ	=	= · =		_			res Yes	No N	Yes	No Yes	No	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye	es No	res
MIDWEST COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONF.	1000	Vac No	Yes · Ye	s No	Yes Y	es Yes		Yes Yes	No.	Yes	Yes	1	NO -	NO -	= =	= =	_ =			ADS —			:, =.		`		Abs	Yes Ye	s: Yes	Yes —
MIDWESTERN COLLEGIATE CONF.	. 1				Ξ.		· –					' 9'	·	- Ye	s Yes	Yes Yes	No Ye	s No	Yes Yes	Nο					· -			Yes Ye		Yes
MILLERSVILLE UNIVERSITY OF KA	. 11		_ :				_	= =		_	_]	_					=	= =		no no les No		Yes Yes	Yes No No Yes Yes No	No No	Yes N No Ye	s Yes		s Abs	Yes Yes
MILLIKIN UNIVERSITY	iii		- :		_ :		_	_ =	=	_	_	1	_	_ :	_		= =	=		_	No Yes	No No	Yes	Yes No	Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Ye	s No	Yes
MILLSAPS COLLEGE	, 10 , 11		_= :						·,	. 🖘	_ ~ ~	1 .		- Ye	s Yes	Yes Yes	No Ye	s No	No Yes		<i>-</i> -		- <u></u>		<u></u> -	<i></i> -	<u> </u>		Yes	
	.	Yes No	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes Y		Yes	No Ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes 5	1	Yes	No - Ye		 Yes Yes	Yes Yes	s, No	No No	Yes	Ξ. Ξ.	Ξ,Ξ	· 📮	<u> </u>	· Ξ.	Ξ.Ξ	Yes	No Ye	s Yes.	Yes.
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTATION CITIES MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY		- <u>.</u> -	- .	- •÷	Yes Y	es Yes	Nn	Yes Ye	s No	Yes	Yes 3		Yes	No -	s Yes	res Yes	No Yes		No	Yes		:_	` := :	<u> </u>	ئىرىنىيە. ئارىخىيە	`- · <u>-</u>	- Yes Yes	No 'Ye		Yes
MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY	I-A	Yes No	Yes	es No	165			· :-	. -	_	÷ ":	1	No	Ýes -						Yes			· -		· -		- Yes	No Ye	s Yes	Yes
MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY MISSISSIPPI UNIVERSITY FOR WOMEN MISSISSIPPI VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY MISSISSIPPI VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY	FAA	Yes Yes	No Yes	es No	No Y	Yes No Yes Yes	yes Yes	Yes Yes	s Yes			1	No.	Yes - Ye	·	es Yes	No Yes	. — s No	No Yes	Yes Yes	= =	= =	=	= =	_			Yes Ye No Ye		Yes Yes
UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIFFI					_		-			_	_	4	 No	- Ye		res Yes	No Yes	s No	No -	Yes Yes			-		-		- TES	No Ye	s Yes	Yes Yes
MISSOURI INTERCULLEGIATE ATTACK MISSOURI SOUTHERN STATE COLLEGE MISSOURI VALLEY CONFERENCE MISSOURI WESTERN STATE COLLEGE	II	Yes	Abs	es Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	s_Yes	Yes	– No	Yes	Yes			— Ye	s Yes Y			_		Yes	<u> </u>	,	. <u>Z</u>			= :		No Ye		Yes
MISSOURI VALLEY CONFERENCE MISSOURI WESTERN STATE COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY LINIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLLIMINA	()II	77	Yes	alla Vad	Ver	Vec N	o Yes	Yes' Y	es Yes	- No	No a s	1		No -	;,	<u> </u>	= =	· <u>-</u>	_ ; _	Yes Yes	<u> </u>		: 'r	<u> </u>	· <u> </u>			Yes Ye No Ye		Yes Yes
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY	∴HAAA A-I-A	Yes No	Yes.	es, Yes	Yes.	Yes Ye	s Yes	No Y	es Yes	Yes	Yes	17.5	-				- Yes	No.	No Yes	Yes	- -			·	<i>'</i> –		Yes"	No Ye No Ye	ısı¹No	Yes
University of Missouri-Annas U114 University of Missouri-Rolla University of Missouri-Rolla University of Missouri-St. Louis	· . II	<u> </u>	· · -							. ` `_	<u>. </u>	4		— 19 Ye	s res '	es Yes	102 100		No Yes			^	- =	<u> </u>	~~~~		₹ No Yes	Ye	S —	ież.
			· `-					_ :		_	-	1	No.	No -				_		 V			-		_			_ ;	s Yes	Var
MONMOUTH COLLEGE (IL.).	 1-868	Yes Yes	s Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	_ Y	es No	yes	Yes Yes	1	Yes	No -	=	= =		=	= =	Yes	= =		=	= =	=	= =	Yes	No Ye	s No	Yes
MONMOUTH COLLEGE (IL.)	I-AA	Yes No	Yes Yes	Yes No Ves Yes	yes Yes	Yes N	lo yes es yes	Yes Y	es Yes	5 165 5 Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes -			_ =	<u></u>	<u> </u>	Yes	— — No.: No	No No	Yes	No. Yes	- No	— — No Ni		No Ye Yes Ye	s No	
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA MONTCLAIR STATE COLLEGE		Yes Yes No	- 14 - 15 - 15 - 15 - 15 - 15 - 15 - 15	<u> </u>		:=	- ,	~	_ ~	- :-	*= : · · ·	T.		÷ :	<u>.</u>	- ⁻	, a ' -	: Ē.	Ξ,Ξ,	· —	No No.	Yes No	Abs	- Yes	Yes	Yes Ye	Yes.	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes
MONTCLAIR STATE COLLEGE MORAVIAN COLLEGE MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY	7 - " LAA	A YAC N	0.102	MU LC	3.7103 .	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes \	es Ye	s Ves	Yes	¥7 `\ . E.	No -	No :	<u> </u>	, _ , _ ,		` <u> </u>	= =	Yes	`	' <u>'</u> 	1 =:	- Yes	. Ξ.,	T : I	Yes≁		- - -	
MORFHOUSE COLLEGE		: " ."	_ }- <u>-</u>			三江		, _ .		:=		1	ث.	ن ت	<u> </u>			-	ž.n	~~	-, <u>-</u> ,	<u>-</u> ي	4=	Ξ		===			W. T.	ار-:
MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	¡⊦AA		E=					· · ·	A			1																		
					100	22 (-)	anua:	ntion	Pro	CPPI	lings	1	Rol	l-Cal	l Voti.	ng _													_ A-i	197
A 106					_ נלו	12 L	211161					ş.																		

A-196 _

14 15 15 15-1 18 1	19 20-1 20 21-1 21-1 21-8 24 25-1 25	26 30 14 19 20-1 20 21-A 29 30 34 54 28 #2-1 32 31 31-1 31-2 31 33-1 33 33 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 WTB A ABCOLVTS A-E A B C	28 34 36 154 35 B A-0
MEMBER NAME DIV 1 MTR		The state of the s	Yes No Yes Yes Yes
MORNINGSIDE COLLEGE MORNS BROWN COLLEGE MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE MOUNT ST MARY COLLEGE (M.Y.) MOUNT ST MARYS COLLEGE (MD.): LAAA Yes No yes yes No Yes Yes COLLEGE OF MOUNT ST VINCENT COLLEGE OF MOUNT ST VINCENT III		- Yes Yes No No No Yes - No - No No Yes No No No No No No Yes No No No No Yes No No No No No No Yes No No No No No No No No Yes No	Yes Yes Abs Yes
MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE (N.Y). MOUNT ST MARY COLLEGE (N.Y). LAAA Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes	S No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No	# 1 Yes = = = = = = = = = Yes = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	Yes Yes No Yes"
MOUNT ST. MARY'S COLLEGE (MU)'		Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
MUUN UNIUN OOCEEGE :: III	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	No	— Yes Yes No Yes
MUHENBERG COLLEGE MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY MUSKINGUM COLLEGE MUSKINGUM COLLEGE MAZARETH COLLEGE (N Y) MISHINGUM COLLEGE (N Y) MAZARETH COLLEGE (N Y) MEBASKA MESLEYAN UNIVERSITY UNIV. OF NEBRASKA AT KEARNEY UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-OMANIA UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-OMANIA UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-OMANIA UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-OMANIA UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS I-AA YES NO YES YES NO YE VENE PIGLAND COLLEGE NEW ENGLAND COLLEGATE CONF NEW ENGLAND COLLEGATE CONF NEW ENGLAND COMMENS 8 MEW HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE NEW JERSEY ATHLETIC CONFERENCE NEW JERSEY ATHLETIC CONFERENCE NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS STATE UNIVERSITY III	가락목록 무,글 글 끝 날아가 때	No.	Yes No Yes Abs Yes Yes Abs Yes No Yes
NAZARETH CULTEGE W NEBRASKA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY HADDI AE NEDBASKA ST YEARNEY	Var Var Ves Vas Yes No Yes Yes	- Yes Yes Yes No Yes No No No Yes Yes	Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-INCOLN	as No Yes Yes No Yes No Yes Yes	No. No	Yes No Yes Yes Yes
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS	es Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes	No No No Yes Yes No Yes Yes No No No	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes — Yes
NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE NEW ENGLAND COLLEGATE CONF			Yes — Yes Yes Yes
NEW HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE	res Yes Yes Yes — Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No	Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes
UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAVEN UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAVEN UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAVEN III	후鄕 라무로돌돌돌품 11111	No No No Yes.	Yes Yes Yes Abs Yes No No Yes Yes Yes
NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY.	Vac Vas Vas Vas No Yes No Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes No No No Yes Yes	Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes No Yes
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY	Yes Yes Yes No No No Yes No		Yes No Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEAMS 1-AAA Yes No Yes Tes Tes TUNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEAMS 1-AAA Yes No Yes Tes Tes TUNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEAMS 11-AAA Yes No Yes Tes Tes TUNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEAMS 11-AAA Yes No Yes Tes Tes Tuniversity Of New Orleams 11-AAA Yes No Yes Tes Tes Tes Tes Tes Tes Tes Tes Tes T		Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes	Yes, Yes Yes Yes Yes
COLLEGE OF NEW ROCHELLE NEW YORK COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONF		No No No No Yes No Yes Abs Yes Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	res — Yes Yes Yes — Yes Yes Abs Yes
N.Y. ST. WOMEN'S COLL. ATHL. CONH.	1 = 1 = 1 = 1		<u> </u>
UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS STATE UNIV COLLEGE-NEW PALTZ COLLEGE OF NEW RODHELLE NEW YORK COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONF N.Y. ST. WORKENS COLL ATHL. CONF N.Y. ST. WORK UNIVERSITY CITY COLLEGE OF NEW YORK NEW STRY COLLEGE NAGARA UNIVERSITY NICHOLLS STATE UNIVERSITY NICHOLS STATE UNIVERSITY	Yes Yes Abs Abs No Abs No No Yes	No No Yes No No	res Yes Abs Yes Yes Yes No Yes No Yes
NIAGARA UNIVERSITY I-AA Yes No No Yes No Nicholls State University III	Yes Yes No No Yes Yes Nu les Yes	- No Yes No Yes No No No No No Yes - No Yes	res Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes
NICHOLES STATE UNIVERSITY NORTH ADAMS STATE COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH ALABAMA NORTH ATLANTIC CONFERENCE UNIV. OF NORTH CAROLINA-SHEVILE UNIV. OF NORTH CAROLINA-CHAPEL HILL UNIV. OF NORTH C	등은 글로를 보고 되지?		res No Yes Yes Yes
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH ALABAMA	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No	Yes Yes Yes	/es ″No∝ Yes 'Yes Yes /es Yes Yes Yes Yes /es, Yes, Yes Yes, Yes
UNIV. OF NORTH CAROLINA-ASHEVILLE. FAAA YES NO TES NO TES NO TES UNIV. OF NORTH CAROLINA-CHAPEL HILL I-A YES - YES	Yes Yes — No Yes No — Yes —	No Yes Yes	res res res res res res Yes Yes Yes Yes res No Yes Yes Yes
UNIV OF NORTH CAROUNA-CHARLOTTE I.AAA YES NO YES YES UNIV OF NORTH CAROUNA-CHARLOTTE I.AAA YES NO YES YES UNIV OF NORTH CAROUNA-GREENSBORO I.AAA YES YES NO YES YES UNIV OF NORTH CAROUNA-WILMINGTON I.AAA YES NO YES YES YES NORTH CAROUNA-WILMINGTON I.AAA YES NO NO NOTH CAROUNA-WILMINGTON II.AAA YES NO YES YES YES NORTH CAROUNA-CENTRAL UNIVERSITY II.AA YES NO YES YES YES YES	Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes No — Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes	No Yes Yes Y	res no res res res res Yes — Yes — res — — —
UNIV OF NORTH CAROLINA-WILMINGTON NORTH CAROLINA AST STATE UNIVERSITY NORTH CAROLINA AST STATE UNIVERSITY NORTH CAROLINA AST STATE UNIVERSITY	No No Yes -	Yes Yes Yes Yes No No No No Yes	Ves No Yes Yes Yes Ves No Yes No Yes
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY I-A Yes No Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
NORTH CAROLINA WESLEYAN COLLEGE NORTH CENTRAL COLLEGE NORTH CENTRAL COLLEGE ATHI COME	東京中央日記日日 1	1: No No No No No Yes Abs No Yes Yes '	Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes —
NORTH CAROLINA AAS STATE UNIVERSITY NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY NORTH CAROLINA WESLEYAN COLLEGE NORTH CAROLINA WESLEYAN COLLEGE NORTH CENTRAL COLLEGE NORTH CENTRAL COLLEGE NORTH CENTRAL INTERCOL ATHL CONF NORTH CENTRAL INTERCOL NORTH CASAS ATHLETIC CONF NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY		Yes Yes Yes No Yes No No _ Yes	res Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
NORTH DAKUIA STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA NORTH BARK COLLEGE NORTH BARK COLLEGE	Yes Yes - Yes Yes No No No	Mo Abe Yes No Yes NO AOS NO NO Yes Yes Y	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Abs Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes
NORTH STAR CONFERENCE I.AA Yes No Yes Tes Tes III. NORTH STAR CONFERENCE I.AA Yes No Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes -	No No — — — — — Yes — — — — Y	es Yes Yes Yes Yes
NORTHEAST CONFERENCE. 1-AAA Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Northeast Louisiana University	Yes No No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes	No No	/es No Yes — Yes /es Yes Yes Yes Yes /es ×Abs Yes Yes Yes
NORTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY NORTHEAST-10 CONFERENCE LAAA Yes No Yes Yes Yes	s Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes	No Yes . — — — — — — Yes — — — — — — — — Y	es Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes
NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY I-AA YES NO YES YES YE	s Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No D Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No	d Na Na	es Yes Yes Yes Yes es Yes Yes Yes —
NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY NORTH CAUFORNIA ATHLETIC CONF	Van	Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes	es yes yes yes yes es No yes No yes
NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY NOTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY NO Yes	s Yes No Yes Yes No Yes No Yes Yes	Yes Ves Ves Ves Ves Ves Ves Ves Ves Ves V	es No Yes No Yes es No Yes Yes Yes
NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	[] 글 글(민골(크) 크고,우() ;;;	Yes Yes Yes No No Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Ho Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No No Yes Yes Yes — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —	'es Yes — Yes — 'es No Yes No Yes
NORTH PARKOLLEGE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTIA NORTH PARK COLLEGE NORTH STAR CONFERENCE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS NORTH STAR CONFERENCE I-AAA YES NO YES YES YES NORTH-BAST CONFERENCE NORTH-BAST LOUISANA UNIVERSITY NORTH-BAST LOUISANA UNIVERSITY NORTH-BAST LOUISANA UNIVERSITY NORTH-BAST LOUISANA UNIVERSITY NORTH-BAST-BAT LLLINGS UNIVERSITY NORTH-BAST-BAT LLUNGS UNIVERSITY NORTH-BAST-BAT LLINGS UNIVERSITY NORTH-BAST-BAT LLINGS UNIVERSITY NORTH-BAST-BAT LLINGS UNIVERSITY NORTH-BAST-BAT LLINGS UNIVERSITY NORTH-BAT BAT LLINGS UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF NORTH-BAT LOWA NORTH-BAT LLUNGS UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF NORTH-BAT LOWA NORTH-BAT MCHGIGAN UNIVERSITY NORTH-BAT MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY		י מי	
	1992 Convention Proceedings	Roll-Call Voting	A-199
A-198	_ 1992 Convention 1 rocccumgo		_

MEMBER NAME	Div	14 1 1 MT	18 18 18	5 1 6 -1	18	10 2 1		1	ı	1 21-8		1	ATR				26 3	30 14 	19 ZI	1 20 11 11	21-A II		10 34 II VTR	54	28 #2 A	-1 32 ABCD	31 3 VT\$	11-1 31-1	2 31 AE	33 -1	33 3 A E	3 33 1 C	28 8	34 36 1-0	154 38
NORTHWESTERN STATE UNIV. (L.A.). WORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY WORNWCH UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NOTRE DAME (CA.). UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME COLLEGE OF NOTRE DAME COLLEGE OF NOTRE DAME COLLEGE OF NOTRE DAME COLLEGE OF NOTRE DAME (MD.) CORLAND UNIVERSITY OBERLIN COLLEGE OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE	I-AA II-A	Yes A	la Yes	Yes 7. No	Yes Yes	Yes ()	res N	lo' N	o Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Y	Yes Yes	. राष्ट्र १ - १ व	g gr	Ţ	No !	No —		· ; ; _					Yes Yes				- }-	· <u>-</u> ·	<u> </u>	Z (Ξ	Yes	No Yes	e (Vee V
NORWICH UNIVERSITY	, III (-, -	:='	;	ੁ -	<u>.</u>	-	- :-	-		Ξ,	_ ,	15		•	Yes'	Yes	Yes	es · Yes	No.	Yes I	Vo No	Yes	Yes		*, -		- ;-	. . 		<u> </u>	Yes	Yes Yes	s No Y
NIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME		Yes	Vo.; No 	_Yes	_No	Yes_1	res_Y	es_Ye	.s _ Ye: 	5 _ YES	_ TES	- 231			1		Tes :	NO	Ξ,	_ '_	· -				Tes	= -		<u> </u>	: - –	-:- -			Yes	Yes _, Yes	- Yes_Y
AKLAND CITY COLLEGE	. ii	= :		=	=	_	_ :			=	_	=	_				= :	- <u>-</u> Yes	Yes	res No	Yes	Yes !	lo Ye	s Yes	Yes :			= =		_		- <u>-</u>	Yes	Yes Yes	s Yes Y
BERLIN COLLEGE CODENTAL COLLEGE	VII 115	= :	- -	<u> </u>	_	=_	_ :							وفوسست برد. س	1	فو مدسونت	- 				· -			-	— A	bs Abs	Yes No	No Ye	s Yes	Yes Y	es Ye	S Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes —	No Ye
BERLIN COLLEGE GLETHGRPE UNIVERSITY HIG ATHERIC CONFERENCE HIG NORTHERN UNIVERSITY HIG STATE UNIVERSITY HIG STATE UNIVERSITY HIG UNIVERSITY HIG WILLEY CONFERENCE HIG WESTEN WILLEY CONFERENCE HIG WESTEN AU UNIVERSITY		-7		: =	Ξ	Ę		_ :		<u>^</u>	.,= `	=:		- 100 mg		· .	`_ :	- -	Ξ.		<u> </u>	<u></u>	^-	· -			Yes	'— > → No 'Ye	s No	Abs	No N	lo 4 Yes	(E	Yes Yes	s Abs Y
HIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY	, iii	Yes!	No 5 No	` o∘;No	Yes .	Yes :	Yes Y	es Y	= _:_ 85 : N	o Yes	~ Yes	No.	Yes al		**************************************	د رسی	Yes Y	es —	<u> </u>		:: <u>-</u>	— · ·	 B, - , T	_	'— I Yes∵	10 = NO T ==	Yes:	Yes Ye	s (No	Yes . —	No Ye	s Abs ——	× Yes →	Yes Yes No Yes	Yes Yes Yes
HIO UNIVERSITY	I-A. I-AA	,Yes ∂l Yes l	No Yes No Yes	s, No s Yes	Yes	Yes 1	Yes :Y Yes :Y	es Ye	es N es N	o∵Yes o Yes	NO.	res .	res Yes		i i	••	No N	NO -	_		· –	· - ·		` - .	Yes Yes	- <u>-</u>	Ξ'	- -		* -	=		∠.Yes Yes	No,Yes Yes Yes	Abs Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
HIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY	111 I- A	Yes	No Yes	s Yes	Yes	— Yes	Yes Y	es Y	es ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		:		No Y	es –	_	= =	_			_	- M	No No	No —	No Ye	s No	Yes —	No Ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes — No Yes	- Yes Ye s Yes Ye
NIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA	i-A . 111	Yes	No Yes	s Yes	Yes —	Yes	Yes Y	es Y	es Ye	s Yes	No.	Yes	Yes 		25		NO Y	es — 	 			:			Yes 1	lo No	No	No Ye	s No	No	No N	o No	Yes Abs	No Yes Yes Yes	s Yes Ye s Yes Ye
LD DOMINION UNIVERSITY	;I-AAA-I;	Yes :	No ¹ Yes	s _	Yes !		Yes ; Y	es Y	es : N	o Yes	Yes	Yes ;	No .	3 ³⁰ , 1 34			No · h	¥0	, -		;= <u>;</u>	` <u> </u>	- / -	<u> </u>	Yes	_; _	Ξ,	= :	-	**=	- `- - ;-	- <u>(</u>	Yes	Yes Yes	No :
HIU UNIVERSITY HIU VALLEY CONFERENCE HIU WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY KILAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY INIVERSITY OF DIKLAHOMA LD DOMINION ATHLETIC CONF LD DOMINION UNIVERSITY TATE UNIV COLLEGE-ONEONTA TATE UNIV. COLLEGE-ONEONTA REGON STATE UNIVERSITY INIVERSITY OF OREGON TATE UNIV. COLLEGE-ONEONTA TITTE UNIV. COLLEGE-ONEONTA TITTE UNIV. COLLEGE-ONEONTA TITTE UNIV. COLLEGE-OSWEGO TITTERBEIN COLLEGE-OSWEGO					`='	·_ ;	Ξ^*	Ξ,		Z J	` <u>-</u> `	<u>-</u>	.— 		糕		Ξ.	- ; -			' Ξ';	Ξ:	<u> </u>	,*- * -,	Y	 s ≻No	No	Yes , No	. No,	Yes I	 No 'N	o Yes	. .		No
REGON STATE UNIVERSITY	I.A.	Yes	No, Yes No Yes	s Yes s Yes	No≥ No	.Yes ∈ Yes	Yes Y Yes Y	'es∴l 'es Y	No∴Ye 'es N	is : Yes Io Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	نحسنسد	1		*No_N No_N	40 —	_	es Yes		_ :		~ - : - :	yes - Yes -		- -				 	- <i>4</i> 1±. - –	££Yes Yes	Yes Yes	
TATE UNIV COLLEGE-OSWEGO	. III III	=			_	_	_	_	= :		_	=	=		4		_ :		Ξ.	= =	=			-	- N	lo Na lo No	No Yes	No No No Yes	No S No	Yes I	No N No N	o Yes o Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes
ACE UNIVERSITY NIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC (CA.)	II FA	Yes	 No Ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes_	Yes_Y	es Y	es	- Yes	No	Yes_	Yes				No_N	- No √o,	Yes Y	es Yes	No -	Yes Ye	s Ye	s No	No -		_						No Yes		No Yes Yes
INIVERSITY OF OREGON TATE UNIV COLLEGE. OSWEGO TITERBRIN COLLEGE. ACE UNIVERSITY INIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC (CA.) ACIFIC 10 CONFERENCE AINE COLLEGE. ARKS COLLEGE OF ST LOUIS UNIVERSITY ARKS COLLEGE OF ST LOUIS UNIVERSITY EACH BELT ATHLETIC CONFERENCE.	I-A	Yes.	No Ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	os Y	es or N	lo Yes	Yes	Yes ~	Yes	**** \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		$\{j: i\}$	No Ye	es * — — Yes	Yes Y	÷ <u>~</u> es Yes	Yes	No N	_ ≩_ lo ∶No	No No	Yes No	- * ` 	<u>,=</u> ,		"-"	(_ : -	, ; <u> </u>	Yes	Yes Yes No ‡Yes	Yes
ARKS COLLEGE OF ST LOUIS UNIVERSITY	LIII'	Yes.	No Ye	s Yes	Yes	}⊸'. Yes	'—∵, Yes.\	es Y	es Y	š Yes	Yes	Yes .	Yes	·			.110 15		_		; <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> , </u>	,	, Yes -	<u> </u>	<u>, i</u> ,	- <u> </u>	-3_	ķΞŻ;			Yes	No Yes	Yes
EACH BELT ATHLETIC CONFERENCE		Ξ.		z : 53	7 (_ .	. <u>#</u> `	الائو ت. —	=-			~' <u>=</u>	- =	=	سست.	.		·- ·			es Yes	Yes	·≕·∶⁻ Yes Ye	 s –	Yes	res -	<u> </u>	'- 3	_ `-	_	ز 'خے د	= -	· :=	ves	No Yes	Yes Ye
EMBRUKE STATE UNIVERSITY ENNSYLVANIA ST UNIV-BEHREND COL.	. ij	=			_		_	_	= :		=	=	_		1		_ :	- Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	No	Yes Ye	s Yes	_ ,	– N Yes -	lo No	Yes '	Yes Yes	No	Yes !	No N4	o No	Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	Abs Ye
ENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY	. I-A I-AA	Yes Yes	No Ye	s Yes	Yes No	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Y Yes Y	fes h fes y	No Yes es No	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes		1_				:	= =		= =	- -	;	es - es -		=	= =	<u> </u>	= :		_	Yes Yes	No Yes Yes Yes	Yes Ye Yes Ye
EPPERDINE UNIVERSITY		Yes	No Ye	š Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes 1	Yes Y	res Y	es Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes .	1	1	_ ` `	No . N	lo = =.			<u>ا ا</u>	<u> </u>	4-	`	es '-	= =	, <u> </u>	= =	~ -	;		φ <u>.</u>	Yes .	Yes "Yes	Yes Ye
HILA: COL. OF TEXTILES & SCIENCE	ji	, <u> </u>	<u> </u>	≟` <u>∸</u>	. <u>'</u>		_	=	_ :	_ ` <u>-</u>	: <u>-</u>	Ξ.	_		3			<u> </u>	- ^ ·	_`=	` <u>-</u> ;	= /=		, <u> </u>	= :			_,_	<u>;_</u> `	在:	= =	· :_	<u> </u>	_ ;	ojY⊑ ∧
ITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY	. ïi	- You			· ·	' Yes	Yes 1	— Yes \	— · Yes 1	⊸ – Vo Ye:	· ` —	Yes	— Yes		-	•	 No Ye	 s -	_ :		_	_ · -	- -	_ ,	 /es		<u>-</u>	- -	· .—	·= `		· '—	Yes	÷ ;÷ /es Yes	Yes Ye
INIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH JOHNSTOWN .	176 18	-				=	=	=			=	_	_		1						_			_	- :		_		V	:					Yes Ye Abs Ye Yes Ye
CLYMOUTH STATE COLLEGE.	. Ñ	_			: <u>-</u>	_	=	_			=	=	=				= =	=	_ :		Ξ.			Ξ.	- N	o No	No 1	es No	No -	Yes Y	s Yes	Yes	Yes I	Vo Yes	Yes Ye
OMONA-PITZER COLLEGES			_ =	= =	=======================================	<u> </u>		<u>-</u> :	Ξ:	<u> </u>	Ξ.	_	=	20		•••		- Yes	Yes Yes	s Yes	: "No : \	Yes N	o No	No Y	- Ye	s Yes	No	No Yes	No.	Yes - Ye	s Yes	- Yes	Yes I	o Yes	⊷No ∸ Abs Ye
ORILLAND STATE UNIVERSITY NIVERSITY OF PORTLAND	. FAAA	Yes	No Ye	es Ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes '	Yes 'Y	es Ye	s No	, Yez	No .		.	.,	No N	· -		- ^ <u>-</u>	} — (= =	ĺΞ	~- ·\ . 	es -	i Aor	Yes 1	es Yes	, No	Yes N	io No	Yes	Yes	es Yes	Yes Yes
ATHOU LEAGUE FACKI BELT ATHLETIC CONFERENCE FARSTIVANIA ST LINIVERSITY FANSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY FANSYLVANIA STATE ATHLETIC CONF. FANSYLVANIA STATE ATHLETIC CONF. FANSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY INVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA FEPPERDNE UNIVERSITY FEIFFER COLLEGE THE MANOR COLLEGE INIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH INIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH INIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH INIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH PLYMOUTH STATE CONLEGE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY (N Y) POMONA-PITZER COLLEGES DOITLAND STATE UNIVERSITY INIVERSITY OF PORTLAND STATE UNIV. COLLEGES TONIVERSITY OF PORTLAND STATE UNIV. COLLEGES TONIVERSITY OF PORTLAND STATE UNIV. COLLEGES PORTLAND STATE UNIV. COLLEGES PRAINE VIEW AAM UNIVERSITY PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE	. I-AA	- آ		_*``	<u>``.∃-</u> ≧	:	. <u>=</u>	<u></u> -		 	- ⁻ -	<u>-</u>	· <u></u> '		S .	.,	= = =	- Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes	Mo Ye	-22' — s No	Yes Y	 es -	· `-'	٠-,٤ -	_ · _		-11	- <u>'</u> -	: - .	Yes I	lo Yes	Yes Ye
MESBYTERIAN CULLEGE	FAÄ	Yes	No Ye	es Ye	s No	Yes	Yes	Yes '	Yes Y	es Ye	s No	Yes	Yes		1		No Yes	s —	_ :		_		=	<u> </u>	es - - Ye	s No	Yes	 No No	No	Yes N	lo No	No	Yes I	lo Yes	Abs Yes
PROVIDENCE COLLEGE	I-AAA I-A	Yes Yes	No Ye	es Ye	s Yes s Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes_	No Ye No Ye	s No s Yes	Yes Yes	No Yes		4		No Yes	s						- \ \	No -		_			_		=	Yes Y	es Yes lo Yes	Yes Yes
UEENS COLLEGE (N.C.)		7 <u></u> .				· , 🖫	. E		Ξ		- : - - : -			,	17		_ =	Yes .	Yes Ye	s No	§ ≛No÷Y	Yes No	∵i	No : Y	 es _	*			ıΞ				Yes N	io Yes	Yes Ye
JUENS COLLEGE (N.T.)	 !!	f:.7.,			کے۔ استار د	<u>.</u>	F.	<u>.</u>	Ξ.	Ξ:Ξ	: <u>(-</u>		` 					3 = .	 			No No) <u>. </u>	No Y	es -	Ξ.	Ξ.	- <u>'</u>	-		- `-	; _	Yes A	bs Yes	No Yes
RESBYTERIAN COLLEGE RINCETON UNIVERSITY RINCIPA COLLEGE ROVIDENCE COLLEGE VIRDUE UNIVERSITY VILEENS COLLEGE (N.C.). VILEENS COLLEGE (N.Y.) VILINCY COLLEGE VILINIFAC COLLEGE	AA-	Yes -	No. Y	es Ye	s No	Yes	No.	Yes	Yes_	No _ Ye	s Yes	Yes	Yes		4: '		No No	o <u>÷</u> `.		- <u>-</u>		<u>-: -</u>	· }^-	·* — ·Υ — ·	es No	بست الرا No	No I		~`≟` No	Yes N	o No	Yes	Yes Y	es Yes:	Abs Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes
RANDOLPH-MACON COLLEGE	. !!!	Ξ	= :			_	_	=	_	= =		_	_					=	_ =		_		_	_ :	- AU	J NO	ADS	10 ADS	NO.	185 N	O Yes	185	765 1	es 165 — —	res ves
UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS		=	= 3	<u>-</u> -	- -	_	=	=	Ξ	_ :		-			1				= =	- 	-	<u> </u>			— No										No Yes Abs Yes
REGIS UNIVERSITY (COLO.)		.2_		ΞΞ	<u> </u>	- =	Ξ.	<u>,-</u> ;	Ξ,			Ξ,	:	٠,,>	- N			- = :	<u> </u>			es Yes	No	, No. 1	10	No	Yes - Y	 es - Yes	No.	Yes' Ye	s No	e No	No Y	es Yes	No Yes Abs Yes Abs Yes Yes Yes Abs Yes Abs Yes
RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE HODE ISLAND COLLEGE	- -	Yee.	No. V	és Ve	s Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes .	Yes	Yes Ye	s No	Yes	- Yes		1.		ii I	;	_ =	- ' <u>-</u>	= .	<u>_</u>	, _ ·		– No Is –	No a	Yes	lo Yes	No '	Yes - Ye	s'Yes	Yes *	Yes Y	es "Yes. es Yes	Yes Yes
RADFORD UNIVERSITY RAMAPO COLLEGE RANDOLPH-MACON COLLEGE RANDOLPH-MACON WOMAN'S COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF REDIANDS REGIS COLLEGE (MASS) REGIS UNIVERSITY (COLD.) RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE RINDOE ISLAND COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND RHODES COLLEGE:	:				· 103	·	=	,	,,	.—`.`	= -	=	, . .		시 -	•		1 -	<u> </u>		· — ·		<i>*_</i> _		_ No	No	A	es Yes	No.,	Yes ~ N	o _No	Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	Abs Yes
								•								D	oll C	7all 1	later																4 201
200						19	92 C	on	vent	ion .	rro	eea	ings			ĸ	ou-C	Call V	ounţ	·															A-201

MEMBER NAME MICLE UNIVERSITY LAA UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND AAA RIDER COLLEGE MIPON COLLEGE MOBERT MARIS COLLEGE ROBERT MARIS COLLEGE ROCKY MOUNTAIN ATHLETIC COMF SALAGED HEART UNIVERSITY SALAGED HEART UNIVERSITY SALAGED HEART UNIVERSITY SALA DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY SAM DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY SETON HALL UNIVERSITY SETON HALL UNIVERSITY SHEPHEDO HOUNTERSITY SHEP	14	se 18	18-1	19 10	26-1 20	21-4 21-	21-8	24 25-1	25	,	-	26	30 1	4 10 20	1 20 21	-A 29	30 34 U VTR	64	28 #2-1 A	32 A3CO VI	31 31-1 3 18	1-2 31 AE	33-1	33 33 A B	33 C	28 34 B A4	38	154 35
Div.	1 11	TR.	, 10-1	" ï	Ti ī	ا ا	Van -	No Ves	Min ~-		7	'Yes"	No "		c	<u> </u>	÷==	4	lbs —	ASCO VI		A A	-,:-	=		Abs At	Yes	Yes Yes
MEMBER NAME	Yes "	No Yes	Yes Y	es" Yes es Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes >	No Yes	Yes		1	Yes No	Yes - No -	·	Ξ-	= '='	= =		res — No —	- -	_ <u>=</u> .	- ;-	- ' 	, - -	- , - '	Yes _Ye	Yes.	,Yas Yes
UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND	Yes	No Yes	Yes a	res Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	S Yes	HO 163	<u> </u>		[ab	` _ °	= =	:	?	- - - .	= =	Ξ.	_ No	No. 1	es . No	No . N	o Yes	_ Yes	s Yes	Yes Ye	S Yes	Yes Yes
RIPON COLLEGE	_,	<u> </u>	Ξ.	= :- = :-	∮. - :	(- 1	,, d No	No. Yes	Yes			No	No -					- Ì		_	es Yes			No No	o Yes		S Yes	Yes Yes
ROANOKE COLLEGE	Yes	No Yes	Yes '	Yes Yes	Yes No	. — ~			=		l	_	_ :	:			- -	_	_ Vec	Do 1	ne vae	Yac Mi	n Yee	NO NO	o Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Abs Yes
ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	_		-		_ =	. - -			-		1	_	_ Y	s Yes Y	es Yes I	No Yes	No No	Yes '	es –	_			- =			_ N	o Yes	Yes Yes
ROCKFORD COLLEGE	_				 	<u>.</u> = .		= =			1 5.			;	- ,;		Abs Yes	No '	— No	Yes ?	No No	Yes N	o Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes N	O Yes	Abs Yes
ROCKY MOUNTAIN ATTILETIC CONT.	Ē	<u> </u>	· - ·	= =		<u> </u>	'		_ , ' ·	4.00	35.	` =	- Y	S 185 1	5 165 1	es 185		. MO.	- No	Yes.	No Yes	Yes :- N	o Abs	Yes Ye	s ·Yes ·	No Y	23 , 103	Yes Yes
ROLLINS COLLEGE	7	-11		=,.=	· · - · · ·	:	= ', = ', = ',	T1		16.24				:		I I	Ξ Ξ	:= *	,_	· <u>-</u> .	I, E.,	= =	<u> </u>	(<u> </u>	- <u>-</u>	Ξ.,	<u> </u>	,ESF
ROSEMONT COLLEGE				"-			'		- =	· eu vanta	4~	-						_		No.	No Ves	Yes N	o Yes	No N	o No	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes Yes
RUST COLLEGE	=			_ =			 Vec	Mo Vi	- Yes		4	No	No -		-		= =	,		_						Yes N Yes Y	o Yes	Yes Yes
BUTGERS UNIVERSITY-NEWARK	Yes	No Ye	es Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes Ye	S YES 1	 -	-			1		— Y		es Yes Y es Yes	es No No Yes		Yes Yes	4	_	= =	Ξ.Ξ	: - .	. =_ =		Yes Y	es Yes	Abs Yes Yes Yes Yes —
SACRED HEART UNIVERSITY	i	- ;				 	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		3.3	y (%)	. –			. , - .		= =	; = ,	- No	No '	Yes Abs	Yes N	o,Yes	No Ab	s, No	Yes Y	es≻Yes es Yes	Yes Yes
SAI FM STATE COLLEGE	l:,-:	· = 3	= =	. Z.		- 45-	<u> </u>	<u>:</u>		113		Ξ,	='.	<u> </u>	-, - .			`= <u>`</u>	_ No	, No	Yes Abs No No Yes Yes.	Abs N	o No	No N	o No	- Y	es Yes	Yes. Yes
SALISBURY STATE UNIVERSITY	i _	,	' fee Yes	Yes Y	s Yes I	No 'Yes	No Yes	No Y	es No	27°L		- No	No No .		_ <u>_</u> ,	= = '	_ ,_	`~ = ·	res — Yes —	·	Ξ'Ξ'		- 4	. - -	- :=:	Yes N	o ∵Yes.	Yes Yes
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY	A . Yes	No: Y	es Yes	Yes Y	s Yes Y	es Yes	Yes Yes Ves Yes	Yes 1	es Yes			No	No -			- -									- -	Yes N	o Yes es Yes	No Yes
SAM DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY	A Yes	NO Y	res yes res yes	Yes Y	es yes y	es Yes	Yes Yes	No 1	es No		1	No	Yes -	es – Y	es No	No No	Yes No	Abs	Yes — Yes — Yes —	_	= =				- -	Yes N	o Yes	Yes Yes
UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO	1 -	No. 1	Ves Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	es Yes	Yes Ye	No	- Yes		1	Yes No	Yes -		= =		= =		res — Yes —	_		= =		= =	- -	Yes Y	es Yes	No Yes
UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO	A Yes	No 1	Yes Yes	Yes	es Yes	res Yes	Yes Ye: No Ye	Yes	res es	1 7	1	r, Yes	No -	_ '_ es 'Yes Y	es Yes	No No	Mo? No	, A	Yes — No —		Yes		_	<u>-</u>	-	Yes Y	es Yes o⊬Yes:	Yes Yes
SAN JUSE STATE UNIVERSITY	AA Yes	· No ·	Yes No	Yes 1	es 163		-	. '=		·	12	_	_ "	es res r 			_ · _		- No	No	- Yes	Ýes∵. N	o Yes	No N	lo No	Yes Y	es . Yes	
SAVANNAH STATE COLLEGE	ıii . —	-, <u>-</u> '	三江	<u> </u>	_ ;_ ;	[] { [<u>-</u> -					No	— Yes ∙	es Yes,Y ~~ ~~	es No	NO NO	Yes Yes		No -				= : :	. -		Yes Y		Yes -Yes
SEATTLE PACIFIC UNIVERSITY	AA .Ye	s No	Yes :Yes	s 🖟 No 🚉	es Yes	Yes __ Yes	Yes Ye	s tes			3	-	— Y	es Yes Y	es Yes	No No	No No	No.	Yes —	=	- -	= :		= =		Yes N	o Yes	No Yes
SETUN HALL UNIVERSITY	1 -	= =		=		= =					1	_	_ Y	es Yes Y		No Yes	No Yes		Yes —	_						Yes Y	es Yes es Yes	Yes Yes
SHENANDOAH UNIVERSITY	ii -					= =	_ :				4	No.	Yes Y	es Yes Y	es Yes	No Yes	No Yes	s Yes	Yes — Yes —	_	Yes Yes		=			Yes Y	es Yes	Yes Yes
SHIPPENSBURG UNIV. OF PA	AA Ye	s No	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Y	s Yes			3 - ∷	-					-, -	_	~	No.	Yes Yes	No N	o No	No N	o No∍ In No	Yes Y	નું Yes es. Yes	Abs Yes ™No Yes
SIENA COLLEGE.	111 -	_, _;		Ξ.Ξ~	·=', = '	<u> </u>	_ = .;		_ =		14 ·	_	= ;			= :=	=	, <u> </u>	- Yes	∸ No	Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes	No N	lo Yes≀	No N	oʻYes	Yes N	lo ··Yes	Yes Yes
SIMPSON COLLEGE	m ·		د سار	: [*]	<u> </u>	·={=	. = '	- · -			4	_	_ Y	es Yes Y	es Yes	No Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	, NO	I NO	TES NO	185 M	10; NO	Un U	10 , 100	169 1	es Yes	No Yes
SLIPPERY ROCK UNIV. OF PA)), -	<u> </u>	_ = <u>;</u>	೯ ೬೫	(m)(m)		_	 		~	4	_	- ;					Voc	- Yes	: Yes	No No	Yes At	os Yes	Yes Ye	es Yes	Yes Y	es Yes es Yes	No Yes
SMITH CALLEGE SOLITH CONF	111 -					- -			Vac Ye	_ IG	1	No	Yes	es Yes 1	es 185 — —	No No	= =	- 162	Yes -	=	No No	= =				Yes N	lo Yes	Yes Yes
SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY	AAA Y	es Yes	Yes Y	es No	Yes Yes	No Yes	165			_	į	_	- Y	es Yes es Yes Y	No ' 'es Yes '	res yes	No N	o Yes o Yes	Yes - Yes -	_				_ = =	- <u>-</u> -	Yes A	bs Yes	Yes Yes
SOUTH ATLANTIC CONFERENCE	, jj	= =	-			.					3	-	` Y	es yes h	es Yes '	veš ves	Yes -	- Yes	Yes -		<u> </u>		-7 <u>-</u> 7			Yes A	bs Yes Io Yes	No Ye
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA-SPARTANBURG	Î ∟&∆	 Yes	r⊥ , NorY	es No	No Yes	No Yes	No .	— No	Yes Y	95°		NO Yes	Yes Yes			Ξ.Ξ	<u> </u>	=	Yes —	Ξ.	I I:	-(ه-	- 1		- , t - , ·	Yes Yes N	es Yes	Yes Yes
SOUTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE	ΉÃ Y	res : No	'.Yes	es Yes	;Yes Yes	Yes No	165			= ``	7 1. ·	- =	_ Y	Vo Yes \ es Yes \	es yes '	No Yes ∸ Yes	No N	o No	Yes — Yes —	·		= :	- : -	.Ę=		Yes N	loʻ_Yes	Yes Yes
SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY	· II	<u>-</u> :		÷:-		J → -	· ·	— — Yes No	Yes Y	C 5	1	No	No					_	Yes -	No	No No	Yes Ye	es No	Yes N		Yes Y	es Yes es Yes	Yes Yes
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA	' AAA- III	Yes No	Yes '	Yes tes	162 (62		-	= -	_	-	1	Ξ.	= :							-				= =		Vec N	in Yes	Vec Ve
UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH SOUTHAMPTON CAMP-LONG ISLAND UNIV	1		. —	Yes No	Yes Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes No	Yes Y	ies ies	}	No Abs	No Yes				= =		Yes -	-	=. = .	= :		= =	- -		bs Yes	Yes Yes
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY	I-A	Yes No	-	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	s Yes Ye - Vac Ye	s Yes	NO NA Yes Na	Yes.	res .	ক্র	No No	Yes Yes	<u>-</u> –	_ <u>÷</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	`	Yes -	<u>. – </u>	= = :		-12 <u>-</u>	Ξ.		Yes Y	es Yes es Yes	Yes Yes
SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY	I-AAA I-A	Yes No Yes No	o yes o yes	yes ter .No Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Ye	s No	Yes Ye	s Yes '	Yes .	"]"	. 150		=			<u></u>	i I	Ä N	No	No No	Yes 1 N	vo , Yes	No N	lo Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	No Yes
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SOUTHERN COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONF	. Ц h -	·	- , -,),I	;			- Voe	<u>-</u> .	周云	· <u>-</u>	No Y	es yes y	es Yes	No Yes			V		=; =	.=	Ξ.Ξ.	~ ~	- <u>,</u> ′	Yes I	lo Ves	No Ye
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN COLORADO	ŀAA	Yes -	- Yes	Yes Ye	Yes Ye	s yes ye	:s tes 			_	1	-	- ¥	es Yes \	'es No 'es Yes '	No Yes	No No	o Yes o Yes	Yes	_		_ :				Yes N	lo Yes 'es Yes	No Ye
SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY	. 11 11							Vas N	 lo -	Yes	1	No				~ ~		-	Yes -	-	- -					— A	bs Yes to Yes	
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY-CARBONDALE	I-AA	Yes Ye	s No	Yes N	o Yes Ye					=	Į	_	_ ¥	es Yes	'es Yes ' 'es No '	Yes Yes Yes No	Yes N Yes -	- No						. = . =				=
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN INDIANA	, ji			_ =	,	- 三: []		:_ :		_	, f	Van	No				= =	: \ <u></u>	— Ye Yes —	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Y	es ; Yes	Yes Ye	es Yes'	Yes - N		Yes Ye
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MAINE	III 	Yes N	No Yes	Yes Ye	s. Yes Y	es Yes Y	es Yes	Yes Y	lo Yes es - Yes	Yes	· .	No	No i	= :=	-, -	-, -	· <u>·</u>		Yes -	: :	- <u>3,</u> (÷	:	_1 _	<u> </u>		Yes Y	es : Yes lo . Yes	√Yes Ye
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI	Î-À	No «V	- Yes es No	Yes YesYe	s yes-ye	10 (NO	No No	No 3	No No	Yes Yes	5 5	. No		=' = ,	= ='.		+= "=	= -	Yes -	, <u> </u>	<u> -</u> - 2.	~	-1E		_4''	Yes I	lo 🕆 Yes	Yes Ye Yes Ye
SOUTHERN COLLEGATE AND COLORADO SOUTHERN CONFERENCE: SOUTHERN CONFERENCE: SOUTHERN CONFERENCE: SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIV. EDWARDSVILLE SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIV. EDWARDSVILLE SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIV. EDWARDSVILLE SOUTHERN INTERCOLLEGATE ATHLETIC CONF UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN INDIANA SOUTHERN INTERCOLLEGATE ATHLETIC CONF UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MADIE SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY-BATON ROUGE SOUTHERN UTAN UNIVERSITY	HAAA	No.	No No	Yes_Y	s, Yes a	es Yes,	NO TES	162 1	oa ;			**			• •	-												
· Southern work								-		*		Pal	l.Cal	ll Votin	0													A-20:
					1992	2 Conv	entic	n Pro	oceed	ıngs	1	NOI	Cui	1 VOIII	8													

A-202 __

14 WEARREN MAINE	16 16 16-1 18 19 20-1 20 21-8 21-1 21-8 24 25-1 25 4TH MTR	26 30 14 19 20-1 20 21-A 29 30 34 64 29 #2-1 32 31 31-1 31-2 31 33-1 33 33 28 34 36 154 35
SOUTHLAND CONFERENCE FAX Yes	16 16 16 18 18 20-1 20 21-A 21-1 21-B 24 25-1 25 MITH NO YES YES YES YES YES NO YES NO YES AND YES YES NO YES	26 30 14 9 20 1 20 21 A 29 30 34 64 28 42 1 32 31 31 1 31 2 31 33 1 33 33 28 34 36 154 35 I I II I
SOUTHWEST BAPTIST UNIVERSITY II SOUTHWEST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY IAA Yes	No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes	- Yes Yes No No Yes No No Yes Yes No No Yes Yes
SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY FAA Tes SOUTHWESTERN ATHLETIC CONF AA Yes	HO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES YES YES NO YES YES YES NO YES	No Yes — — — — — — — — — Yes — — — — — — — — — — — Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
SPRINGFIELD COLLEGE		No Yes
ST, AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE		No No No No Yes No Yes, Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY AAA Yes COLLEGE OF ST. CATHERINE	No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Tes Tes Tes Tes Tes Tes	No. No. No. The second of the
COLLEGE OF ST. ELIZABETH.	Yes No Yes	The state of the s
ST. FRANCIS COLLEGE (PA) I-AAA Yes ST. JOHN FISHER COLLEGE III —	No No Yes	No Yes — — — Yes — — — Yes
ST JOHN'S UNIVERSITY (MINN)	Yes No Yes	No Abs No No - Yes No Abs No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes
ST, JOSEPH'S COLLEGE (ND.)	No No No No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No	Yes Yes Yes Yes No No No No No Yes Yes Yes No Yes
ST LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY: III		Yes No Yes Yes No Yes No Yes No No Yes
ST. LOUIS INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC CONF	No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes	No No
ST MARY'S COLLEGE (CALIF) I-AAA Tes ST MARY'S COLLEGE (IND) III —	TES NO TES NO TES	No No
ST MARY'S COLLEGE (MINN)		Yes Yes Yes Yes Ho No No Abe No No No Yes No Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes
ST NORBERT COLLEGE.		Yes Yes No No Yes No Yes No No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes
ST PETER'S COLLEGE	Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes	No Yes No No No No No No No No Yes Yes Yes No Yes No Yes
COLLEGE OF ST ROSE -		- Yes Yes Yes No No Yes No Yes
STANFORD UNIVERSITY STATE HAIV OF MY ATHI FTIC CONF	No Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes	Yes No No No Yes No Yes
COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND. STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIV. FAA Yes	No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes	No No No Yes
STETSON UNIVERSITY STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes	No No Yes
STILLMAN COLLEGE		No No Yes Yes No Yes
STATE UNIV OF NY-STONY BROOK III — SUFFOIK INNVERSITY III —		
SLIN BELT CONFERENCE	No Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes - No Yes Yes	No No — — — — — — — — — Yes — — — — — Yes
SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY		Yes' No No No Yes Mo Yes No No Yes
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY	No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No — Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes — Yes — Yes
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY I-A Yes TEMPLE UNIVERSITY I-A Yes TEMPLE UNIVERSITY I-AA Yes	Yes No Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No No No No No Yes Yes	No No No
TENNESSEE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY	Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No No Yes	No. No. Yes
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE-KNOXVILLE I-A Yes UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE-MARTIN II —	No Yes Yes Yes - Yes - Yes - Yes - Yes - Yes Yes - Yes Yes - Yes Yes - Y	Yes
		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS-SAN ANTONIO LAAA Yes TEXAS ARI UNIVERSITY	Yes No Yes Yes Yes No No Yes No Yes No	NO NO Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes NO NO Yes Yes NO Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY I-A Yes TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY I-A Yes	Yes No Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Mo Yes Yes No No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes	No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS-PAN AMERICAN	No No Yes Yes Yes No No No No Yes Yes	No No Ho - Yes No Yes Yes Yes No Yes
TEXAS IEUH UNIVERSITY	No. No. Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, No. No. Yes, No. No. Yes, Yes, No. No. Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, No. Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes,	No No Yes
	,	י מסוק מיוב מות במות במות עודי במות נודים במות נודים במות מות במות במות במות במות במות במות
A-204	1992 Convention Proceedings	Roll-Call Voting A-205

		18 18-1	10 10	20.1	90 91	L 21.1	91. B 2/	25.1	- 25	-1		26	30	14 19	20-1	20 21-	A 29	30	34 64	28 #	2-1 3	2 31	31-1 31-2	31 3	13-I 3	3 33	33 26	34 :	55 154 35
	NTR	10 10-1	7			 			MTX 	1813	-6-	_•			II.	_		_ II V	34 64 19		ABCC No. No.	Ver	31-1 31-2 Van Van	A-E	۸ نی∨ ≃تیان	B	33 26 1 C	_A0	es Yes Yes [
THOMAS MORE COLLEGE	No Ye	es No	Yes Yes	Yes -	res Yes	No.	Yes: No	Yes	Yes .				Yes Yes	_ : _ :	ارستا وینده	= =	<u> </u>	: = :	<u> </u>	Yes Yes						·	- Yes	'No Y	es Yes Yes
TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY I-AAA Yes	No Ye	es Yes` es Yes-	Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes⊬No	Yes No	Yes Yes No "No	· No	Yes No	- (C)		No	No :	_ = =	<u>-</u> -	<u> </u>	• =		- <u>'</u> -	-Yes		,	Ho .Vee		I 3I		- Yes		es Yes Yes
TRENTON STATE COLLEGE	.'				=		= =		<u>-</u>	بة أ أ	****	_			_			· –)	es Yes	s Yes	Yes Yes	No '	Yes Yes	s No	No No	Yes Y	es yes yes
TRINITY COLLEGE (CUNN) TRINITY UNIVERSITY (TEX)			= =	_	_ :	: =	= =	_	_			=	= :			_ =	=	=	= =	_	No No	No -	165 165	163	785 NO	res	785 — — —	785 1	es No Yes
TROY STATE UNIVERSITY				Ver	Vec Ve		Yes Yes	Yes	Yes	4		Yes	No -	= =	_		=	_		Yes		: =		-		s Yes \	- Yes	Yes Y	'es Yes — 'es Yes Yes
TULANE UNIVERSITY	s_No-Ye	es Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Ye	s No,	Yes No	Yes	Yes	. «	44. 14.41	No '	Yes :		-	= '-	- No	No	No No	Vec .		·~_·					Yes Yes Yes	Yes Y	es Yes Yes
TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY -	.⊬No Y	es Yes	Yes Yes	*Yes .	Yes Ye	s No	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes		<u>-</u> :					<u> </u>	Yes		Yes	No Yes	- No	No Ale	Yes	- Yes	No. Y	
U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY		_ <u>;</u> ;	Œ. Œ	. <u>. </u>	Ţ: =	<u> </u>	:=, =	=	-:-		-	·Yes \			_			~	÷ . ÷	, V	No No	. Yes	No Yes	No.	No ∰ No	(No.)	Yes Yes	∴Yes ∉ Y	es No Yes; es Yes Yes;
U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY	s No Y	es Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Ye Yes Ye	s Yes s Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes —	1		Yes		= =	=			Ξ	= =	Yes		=	= =	=		_	- Yes	No Y	es Yes Yes es — Yes
UNION COLLEGE (N Y)		= =	= =	_	_ =		= =	_	-	,		=	= :		_	_ =	=	=	= =	— Y	es No	Yes	No Yes Yes Yes	No. 1	res No	No.	No Yes	Yes Y	es Abs Yes es Abs Yes
UPPER IOWA UNIVERSITY		==			=-:		<u>-5</u> -5		; ;= . ~;	ু হ			=	_ =	,	ΞΞ	-=	= :	=		No No	NO.	NO ADS No No	NO.	NO NO	No	No Yes	Yes Y	es No Yes
UPSALA COLLEGE III -	y_ 2		, <u> </u>	· - :	Ver N	o No	No A No	. — Yes	: — y − su No y s	ري. ارام	i.	No	No -	<u> </u>	-	= '=		` : : :	_ , <u>_</u> ·	Yes	No No	· No	No Yes	(No.)	res - No	No. Y	Yes '-Yes' 	3Yes .Y 2No. Y	es Yes, Yes es Yes Yes es Yes Yes es Yes Yes
UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY.	sı, No 🚉	No Yes	182 - 161	Yes	Yes Ye	s No.	Yes Ye	No	Yes	?		·,	÷	-, , -,	~ 			demand for a	error webs	-	ES NU	- NO 1	103 _ 63	NO!	ICS NO	No.	- Yes Yes Yes	Yes Y	es Yes Yes esYes
SUNY INST. OF TECHNOLOGY-UTICA/ROME										,	Ì	_	_ Y	es Yes	Yes 1	es N				_									
VALDOSTA STATE COLLEGE II - VALPOSTA STATE COLLEGE II -	s No Y	es Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes N	Yes	Yes	1			No - Yes -	= =	_		_			Yes		=		_	= =	Ξ	- Yes	Yes Y	es Yes Yes es Yes Yes es Yes — es Yes Yes
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	s No Y	es Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Ye	S Yes	165 TE	5 165	s tes		3		No -	= =		- -		نام حب	,-	Y	es No	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	No Y	es Yes	Yes Y	s Yes Yes
UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT	s - No - Y	res Yes No Yes	No Yes	S Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes, Ye Yes, N	s Yes o Yes	s Yes s Yes	30.4	 	Yes	No - Yes -	= ,.=;	` <u> </u>	ΞĘ	<u> </u>	`=' ·:	- <u>`</u> ;;;	No.	_:=	· - :	= =		_g=	35-7-7-1 35-1	— ⊜Yes — No	Abs.:Yi No., J	es Yes Yes es Yes Yes es No Yes es No Yes
VILLANDYA UNIVERSITY I-AAA YO	S No-	Yes Yes	Yes Ye	S Yes	No Ye	s ;Yes	·Yes Ye Yes N	s Yes o Yes	s Yes : s Yes .	-13-46		Yes Y	es -	= =	Ξ,	_ ′=	_		- ;-	Yes .	- : -	`` <u> </u>	Ξ. 🖫	<u> </u>	_``_) = :	- Yes.	No . Y	s No Yes
VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE	No 1	Yes × Yes	"Yes ¿Yes	s. Yes.	Yes . N	lo Yes	_Yes: Ye	s . Yes	s°Yes. ∧	12		-	/es - 	- Yes	_ `	es No	No	No	No No	Yes Yes		ئر <u>:</u> -	74 î:		- A=	<u>*</u>	— Yes, — Yes	ξNoΩYα — Y	es_No <u>≗</u> Yesi es Yes Yes
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE IA VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY II VIRGINIA UNION UNIVERSITY II VIRGINIA WESLEYAN COLLEGE III UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA IA A WABASH COLLEGE III WAGNER COLLEGE III WAGNER COLLEGE III WAGNER COLLEGE III WARTBURG COLLEGE III WASHBURN UNIV. OF TOPEKA III			= =	_	= :			-	_			_		- Yes	_	- No) 	!	No No	_ i	 No No	No.	No No	No Y	– – Jes No	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes Y	rs Yes Yes rs Yes Yes rs Yes Yes
VIRGINIA WESLEYAN COLLEGE	s No '	Yes Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes N	o Ye	s No	i		Yes								Yes -	lo No	Yes	No Yes	No I	io Yes	Yes Y	— Yes	Yes Yes	s Yes Yes
WABASH COLLEGE	s No	Yes Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes Ye	s Ye	s Yes		,	No I Yes Y	No -	E E	Ξ	_, _	_ :	: <u> </u>		Yes e		7		در جندر ورخ		<u></u>	- Yes	Yes Y	es Yes Yes es No Yes es Yes, Yes es Yes Yes
WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY 1-A Y	is a, No	Yes . Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	No 1	lo Yes	No -	- Ye:	5 YES "	ر د درو				Yes	- Vac V	N	. Ž	' <u>-</u> ;	Yes	- N	lo No	(= -;	No Abs	Yes .	No No	É No i	No Yes	Yes'-Ye	s Yes Yes
WASHBURN UNIV. OF TOPEKA. II	<u>.</u>	<u> </u>	J = 1	_ ·=·	Ξ. :	- • =	_, -		-	بر ت س	r.,	_	<u> </u>				- 103	~ -	- , ; = ;			Ţ.	_; ; , ,	7	=:=	<u>}</u>		NO. Te	s Yes Yes
WASHINGTON & LEE UNIVERSITY					_ :		_ :		<u> </u>				<u> </u>		_		=	= =		- Ye	es No	TES	NO TES	NO !	NO NO	NO N	es Yes No Yes	Yec Ye	e Yet Yac
WASHINGTON COLLEGE (MD) WASHINGTON STATE LINIVERSITY	es No	Yes Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Y	es No	Yes N	o N	o Yes			No Y	es -	=	Ξ		_	= :		TES -		- ·		- ·			- Yes	Yes Ye	s No Yes
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY (MG)	es No_	Yes_Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Y	es No	_Yes_Ye	ș Ye	s Yes .	F10	a. L.	Yes Y	es - - Ye	s Yes	_ Yes Y	es No	Yes	No F	o Yes	Yes - Yes* -		Ξ.	23	_ ~:		- <u>=</u> -	- Yes	Abs N	S Aos res O Yes No S Yes Yes S Yes Yes
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY (MICH.)	5,5,	,£.,5	; <u> </u>	-		<u> </u>			- <u>-</u>			:		o Yes	Yes Y	es yes	Yes	No h	lo Yes	Ýes• -	-/-	<i>-</i> =		_,		-	- Yes	Aos - Ye	s Yes Yes
WAYNESBURG COLLEGE III WERER STATE UNIVERSITY LAA Y	es No	Yes 🚞	∕*- <u>-</u> • γ ₀	s Yes	Yes Y	es No	Yes Y	is Ye	s Yes		. ~	Yes Y	es -	o yes	_ :	_ `=	Ξ			Yes -	-:	- : :	Ξ`Ξ,	= :		· ;>-	- Yes	No Ye	s Yes Yes
WEBSTER UNIVERSITY	_ * _ r	ت المياد - المياد	^ <u></u>	`	*=:·		'- :			المشدوب ا	,				_		_			_ N	o Yes	163	40 102	162 16	S NO	NO 15	55 165	— re	s No Yes
WELLES COLLEGE	_ =	_ =	= :			= =	_ :					= =	= =	- -	= :	= =		= =	=	Ye	s No	No Y	es Yes	No Ye	s Yes	No Ye	es Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes Yes
WESLEY COLLEGE.			_ :		_		_ :								:		. .	= =		Ye	s Yes	Yes_!	Vo No	Yes Ye	s Yes	Yes Yı	es Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes —
WEST CHESTER UNIV. OF PA.		-75	- (- Van	V 1	oe Ver	Vec		- Vac	4 4	<u>,</u> ,	No N	- Yes	s Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes	Yes Ye — ∴	yes .	No :-		Έ.,			- 6 -		No Yes	No Ye	s Yes Yes
WEST COAST CONFERENCE	es No.	TES TES	TES 19	÷ :	163 1		_				۲,۰	_ =	Yes	s Yes:	— ∙0 Yes Ye	s No	Yes	N	Yes:			_ :	=:=	\equiv	-(`.=;	 			
WEST LIBERTY STATE COLLEGE WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY	I, Æ2	, I y, I	72	<u> </u>	YE :	= 3.=	'. <u>-</u>	Ξ:		, vi, i	-	N	–∴Yes ≀n –	s Yes	Yes Yo	2s . Yes	_Yes _	No N	o Yes	Yes	· , — ,	# <u>-</u>	±1.±;	· = ; =	-1:-	_=	Yes :	No Ye	s_Yes_Yes,
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY I-A \	es Yes es No	No Yes Yes Yes	No You	es yes es yes	Yes Y	res yes res yes	Yes Y	es te es Ye	es res es yes			No N Yes Ye	io	· <u>-</u>	_ :		_	= =		Yes -	=	= :		= =	= =	= :	- Yes	No Ye	Abs Yes
WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY I-AA) WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY III	es No	Yes Yes	Yes Y	es Yes	Yes \	res No	Yes Y	es N	ON OF			No N	 In -	_	_		_		Ξ,	— N	o No	No Y	es Abs	No Ye	s No	No Ye	s Yes	NO TES	NO TES
WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY	es No	Yes Yes	No_N	lo Yes	_Yes \	res No res No	Yes !	No Ye No Yi	es yes es No		4	No N	io, .			- I	:	<u> </u>	_=-	/es :-	* /	Ξ-		=-:			- 185 - Yes	Yes Ye	s Yes Yes s Abs Yes s No Yes s Yes Yes s Yes Yes s Yes Yes s Yes Yes
WESTERN MARYLAND COLLEGE		Ves Ves	Yes -V	es Yes	Yes Y	_ s ∕es No	Yes Y	es Y	 es No		. •	No: N	īo, <u>-</u>	; ;	Ξ.;	-, -			<u>.</u>	— No ∕es _a , –	Yes`	res I	o Yes	Yes - Ye	s Yes	,N0 = Ye	s Yes " - Yes ,	Yes Yes	Yes Yes
WESTERN MECHIGAN UNIVERSITY WESTERN NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE			/左	=	: <u>~</u>		= :	Ξ.	_ , _ , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	اگر آد عمل	, '-,			Yes '					Yes	^ - /es	: <u>-</u> :	_ 	:	<u> </u>	Ų÷.	ـــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	Yes.»	Nog Ye	Yes Yes
WASHINGTON & JEFFERSON COLLEGE WASHINGTON & LEE UNIVERSITY WASHINGTON OLLEGE (MD) WASHINGTON TO COLLEGE (MD) WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY (MO) UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY (MC) WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY WAYNE STATE COLLEGE (ME) WAYNE STATE COLLEGE (ME) WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY WEBSTER UNIVERSITY WEBSTER UNIVERSITY WEBSTER UNIVERSITY WELLESLEY COLLEGE WENTWOTH INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY WESLEY COLLEGE WEST LIBERTY STATE COLLEGE WEST LIBERTY STATE COLLEGE WEST UNIVERSITY WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY WESTERN CANDLINA UNIVERSITY WESTERN MCHIGAN UNIVERSITY WESTERN MCHICAGE WESTERN	en e ma	·	'••د∷ته مه			•	- `		• •																			,	
											F	Roll-C	Call	Votu	ıg _					_									A-207
A-206		-		- / 2 (

Section Sect	14 15 16 18 19 20-1 20 21-4 21-1 21-5 24 25-1 25 mits	26 30 14 89 20-1 20 21-A 29 30 34 64 28 #2-1 32 31 31-1 31-2 31 33-1 33 33 33 28 34 36 154 35 1
MEMBER NAME. 14 16 16 18 18 18 201 20 21.4 21.1 21.8 24 25.1 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 2	MEMBER NAME WESTFIELD STATE COLLEGE WILLAMO COLLEGE (ILL.) WILLAMO SCRITT COLLEGE WILLAMO SCRITT C	
MEMBER MAME 111 8 97 102 102 116 112 97 97 72 101 51 109 101 77 38 71 42 55 48 71 42 55 48 71 42 55 48 71 42 55 48 71 42 55 48 71 42 55 48 71 42 55 48 71 42 55 71 71 71 71 71 71 71	VALE UNIVERSITY YAR UNIVERSITY YORK COLLEGE (PA) YORK COLLEGE (N Y) YORK COLLEGE (N Y) YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY III III YORK COLLEGE (N Y) YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY I-AA YES YES NO YES NO YES NO NO YES NO NO YES YES	No Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes
MEMBER MAME 111 8, 97 102 102 16 112 97 97 72 101 51 109 101 73 97 72 101 51 109 101 73 97 72 101 51 109 101 73 97 72 101 51 109 101 73 97 72 101 51 109 101 73 97 72 101 51 109 101 73 97 72 101 51 109 101 73 97 97 97 97 97 97 97	14 16 16 18-1 15 19 20-1 20 21-A 21-1 21-B 24 25-1 25 METRI	26 30 14 19 20-1 20 21-A 29 30 34 54 28 #2-1 32 31 31-1 31-2 31 33-1 33 33 33 28 34 36 154 35 I II II II II II II VTR A ABCO VTS AE A B C B A-D
	MEMBER NAME Division I-A Yes Votes. 111 8. 97 102 002 116 112 97 97 72 101 51 109 101 Division I-A Yes Votes. 88 55 60 81 59 86 86 66 66 76 60 70 43 85 80 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90	96 140 166 184 189 57 142 59 49 116 442 113 41 119 88 201 36 181 72 186 186 673 482 747 561 717 64 59 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
	_ 1992 Convention Proceedings	Roll-Call Voting A-209

Appendix C **86th Annual Convention Committees Nominating Committee**

Chair-David A. Jacobs

I-1-Robert W. Mullen. La Salle University

I-1-Sondra Norrell-Thomas, Howard University

I-2-R. Daniel Beebe, Ohio Valley Conference

I-2-Charles Cavagnaro, Memphis State University

I-3-Del Brinkman, University of Kansas

I-3-Linda G Herman, Illinois State University

I-4-Jim G. Malik, San Diego State University

I-4-Robert M. Sweazy, Texas Tech University

II-1-Louise Albrecht, Southern Connecticut State University

II-2-Douglas T. Porter, Fort Valley State College

II-3-Dean Davenport, Ferris State University

II-4-To be appointed

III-1-Gregory L. Lockard, Montclair State College

III-2-Geraldine Knortz, Hamilton College

III-3-James E. Foels, Oberlin College

III-4-David A. Jacobs, Whittier College

Men's Committee on Committees

Chair-Daniel G. Guerrero

District 1-Chester S. Gladchuk, Boston College

District 2-George Larry James, Stockton State College

District 3-Paul Griffin, University of South Florida

District 4-Robert T. Becker, Saginaw Valley State University

District 5-Prentice Gautt, Big Eight Conference

District 6-James Vick, University of Texas at Austin

District 7-Stanley B. Sheriff, University of Hawaii

District 8-Daniel G. Guerrero, California State U., Dominguez Hills

At Large-Marino H. Casem, Southern University, Baton Rouge

At Large-Richard J. Hazelton, Trinity College (Connecticut) At Large-David M. Hutter, Case Western Reserve University

At Large-James A. Martin, Tuskegee University

Women's Committee on Committees

Chair-Carolyn Dixon

District 1-Laurie Priest, Mount Holyoke College

District 2-Robertha Abney, Slippery Rock Univ. of Pennsylvania

District 3-Bettye Giles, University of Tennessee, Martin

District 4-Peggy Pruitt, Ohio University

District 5-Andrea Myers, Indiana State University

District 6-Carolyn Dixon, Texas Christian University

District 7-Katherine E. Noble, University of Montana

District 8-Marcia L. Saneholtz, Washington State University

At Large-Harriett L. Crannell, Millikin University

At Large-Carol M. Dunn, California State U., Los Angeles

A-210 _______1992 Convention Proceedings

At Large-Janet D. Lucas, James Madison University At Large-Jovce Wong, University of Rochester

Voting Committee

Chair-Katherine E. Noble

District 1-Susan E. Chapman, Worcester State College

District 2-Daniel P. Starr, Canisius College

District 3-L. Douglas Johnson, University of Miami (Florida)

District 4-Steve Becker, University of Wisconsin, Superior

District 5-Lynn Dorn, North Dakota State University

District 6-Gerard L. St. Martin, U. of Southwestern Louisiana

District 7-Katherine E. Noble, University of Montana District 8-Barbara G. Walker, University of Oregon

At Large-Don Bryant, University of Nebraska, Lincoln

At Large-Tynes Hildebrand, Northwestern State U. (Louisiana)

At Large-Norman D. Kaye, St. Leo College

At Large-Kathy Lindahl, Michigan State University

At Large-William Thomas, Tennessee State University

Memorial Resolutions Committee

Chair-Laurie Priest

James Dovle, DePaul University Catherine C. Hacker, College of St. Rose Laurie Priest, Mount Holyoke College

Credentials Committee

Chair-Paul H. Brand

Paul H. Brand, Univ. of Alabama, Huntsville Michael Gilleran, West Coast Conference To be appointed

Parliamentarian

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

1993 Convention

Loews Anatole, Dallas, Texas, January 13-16

Committees	Α.	.7	1	•

Appendix	D
----------	---

Past (Conventi	on S	Sites
--------	----------	------	-------

	rasi	COLLACTION OFFICE
Convention	Year	City, Hotel
1st	1906	New York City (Murray Hill)
2nd	1907	New York City (Murray Hill)
3rd	1908	New York City (Murray Hill)
4th	1909	New York City (Murray Hill)
5th	1910	New York City (Astor)
6th	1911	New York City (Astor)
7th	1912	New York City (Astor)
8th	1913	New York City (Astor)
9th	1914	Chicago (LaSalle)
10th	1915	New York City (Astor)
11th	1916	New York City (Astor)
12th	1917	New York City (Astor)
13th	1918	New York City (Astor)
14th	1919	New York City (Astor)
15th	1920	Chicago (Sherman)
16th	1921	New York City (Astor)
17th	1922	New York City (Astor)
18th	1923	Atlanta (Georgian Terrace)
19th	1924	New York City (Astor)
20th	1925	New York City (Astor)
21st	1926	New York City (Astor)
22nd	1927	New York City (Astor)
23rd	1928	New Orleans (Roosevelt)
24th	1929*	New York City (Astor)
25th	1930	New York City (Astor)
26th	1931	New York City (Astor)
27th	1932	New York City (Astor)
28th	1933	Chicago (Stevens)
29th	1934	New York City (Pennsylvania)
30th	1935	New York City (Pennsylvania)
31st	1936	New York City (Pennsylvania)
32nd	1937	New Orleans (St. Charles)
33rd	1938	Chicago (Sherman)
34th	1939	Los Angeles (Biltmore)
$35 \mathrm{th}$	1 94 0	New York City (New Yorker)
36th	1941	Detroit (Book-Cadıllac)
37th	1942	New York City (Astor)
	1943	No meeting
38th	1944†	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St Louis (Jefferson)
41st_	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (St. Francis)

*Convened January 1, 1930. †Officers, Executive Committee and chairs of rules committees only.

44th 1950 New York City (Commodore) 45th 1951 Dallas (Adolphus) 46th 1952 Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza) 47th 1953 Washington (Mayflower) 48th 1954 Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza) 49th 1955 New York City (New Yorker) 50th 1956 Los Angeles (Statler Hilton) 51st 1957 St. Louis (Jefferson) 52nd 1958 Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford) 53rd 1959 Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton) 54th 1960 New York City (Astor) 55th Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton) 1961 56th 1962 Chicago (Conrad Hilton) 57th 1963 Los Angeles (Statler Hilton) 58th 1964 New York City (Commodore) 59th 1965 Chicago (Conrad Hilton) 60th 1966 Washington (Sheraton Park) 61st 1967 Houston (Sheraton Lincoln) 62nd 1968 New York City (Biltmore) 63rd 1969 Los Angeles (Hilton) 64th 1970 Washington (Statler Hilton) 65th Houston (Astroworld) 1971 66th 1972 Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat) 67th 1973 Chicago (Palmer House) 1st Special 1973 Chicago (Regency Hyatt House) 68th 1974 San Francisco (St. Francis) 69th 1975 Washington (Sheraton-Park) 2nd Special 1975 Chicago (Palmer House) St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn) 3rd Special 1976 70th St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn) 1976 71st 1977 Miami Beach (Fontainebleau) 72nd 1978 Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza) 73rd 1979 San Francisco (St. Francis) 74th 1980 New Orleans (Fairmont) 75th 1981 Miami Beach (Fontainebleau Hilton) 4th Special 1981 St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront) 76th 1982 Houston (Hyatt Regency) 77th San Diego (Town and Country) 1983 78th 1984 Dallas (Loews Anatole) 79th 1985 Nashville (Opryland) 5th Special 1985 New Orleans (Hyatt Regency) 80th 1986 New Orleans (Hilton Riverside) 81st 1987 San Diego (Town and Country) 6th Special 1987 Dallas (Loews Anatole) 82nd 1988 Nashville (Opryland) 83rd 1989 San Francisco (Hilton) 84th 1990 Dallas (Loews Anatole) 85th 1991

Nashville (Opryland)

Appendix E

NCAA Officers, 1906-1992

Years

Name, Institution

President 1906-1913-Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy 1914-1916-LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University 1917-1929-Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy 1930-1932 - Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University 1933-1937-Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten) 1938-1940-William B. Owens, Stanford University 1941-1944 - Phillip O. Badger, New York University 1945-1946-Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming 1947-1949-Karl E. Lieb, University of Iowa 1950-1952-Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California 1953-1954-Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa 1955-1956-Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College 1957-1958-Frank N. Gardner, Drake University 1959-1960 - Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College of Colorado 1961-1962-Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University 1963-1964-Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa 1965-1966 - Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University 1967-1968-Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan 1969-1970 - Harry M. Cross, University of Washington 1971-1972-Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville 1973-1974-Alan J. Chapman, Rice University 1975-1976-John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University 1977-1978 - J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas at Austin 1979-1980-William J. Flynn, Boston College 1981-1982 – James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri) 1983-1984 - John L. Toner, University of Connecticut 1985-1986-John R. Davis, Oregon State University 1987-1988-Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University 1989-1990 - Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville -Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego 1991-Secretary-Treasurer 1906-1908-Louis A. Bevier Jr., Rutgers University, New Brunswick -William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia 1908 (Treasurer only) 1909-1939 - Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University 1940-1944-Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten) 1945-1951 – Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten) 1952-1954-Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska, Lincoln

1961-1962-Rev. Wilfred H Crowley, Santa Clara University 1963-1964-Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University 1965-1966-Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines 1967-1968-Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University 1969-1970-William J. Flynn, Boston College 1971-1972-Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, University of District of Columbia 1973-1974-Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University 1975-1976-Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University 1977-1978-Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College 1979-1980-James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri) 1981-1982-John L. Toner, University of Connecticut 1983-1984-John R. Davis, Oregon State University 1985-1986-Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University 1987-1988-Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton 1989-1990-Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego 1991--B. J. Skelton, Clemson University **Division I Vice-President** 1983-1984-Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University -Arliss L. Roaden, Tennessee Technological University -Lewis A. Cryer, Pacific Coast Athletic Association 1987-1988-Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville 1989-1990 - B. J. Skelton, Clemson University 1991-1992-Douglas S. Hobbs, University of Čalifornia, Los Angeles Division II Vice-President -Edwin W. Lawrence, University of Alaska Fairbanks 1984-1985-Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University -Asa N. Green, Livingston University 1987-1988-Howard Elwell, Gannon University 1989-1990-Jerry M. Hughes, Central Missouri State University -Anthony F. Ceddia, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania

Division III Vice-President 1983 -Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa) 1984-1985-Elizabeth A Kruczek, Fitchburg State College 1986-1987-Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego 1988-1989-Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster 1990-1992 - Rocco J. Carzo, Tufts University

1957-1958-Edwin D. Mouzon Jr., Southern Methodist University

1955-1956-Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan

1959-1960-Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University



